

VOL. XXI. (XL.)
1880.

[THIRD SERIES.]

No. LXXXII. (CXCVI.)
OCTOBER.

THE MONTH

AND

Catholic Review.



LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; M. H. GILL AND SON.

GLASGOW: H. MARGEV. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: JOHN B. PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

NEW YORK AND MONTREAL: D. AND J. SADLIR.

Price Half-a-Crown.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

*TO FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS TO THE MONTH AND
CATHOLIC REVIEW.*

THE Subscription to *The Month and Catholic Review* for all countries included in the Postal Union is the same as in England and Ireland, *i.e.* 30/- a year *paid in advance*. Foreign Subscribers can receive the numbers at this rate by sending their addresses and subscriptions to the Office, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square. Cheques to be drawn upon any London Bank, and Money Orders upon the Post Office, London, payable to Mr. JOSEPH HAGUE.

ST. JOSEPH'S
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,
48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

T E R M S .

I. For Subscribers who pay in advance :

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------------|
| For a Month..... | 1 Vol. | at a time... | <i>Two Shillings.</i> |
| For One Quarter | 3 Vols. | " | <i>Six Shillings.</i> |
| For Half a Year | 1 Vol. | " | <i>Six Shillings.</i> |
| For Half a Year | 3 Vols. | " | <i>Half a Guinea.</i> |
| For a Year | 1 Vol. | " | <i>Half a Guinea.</i> |
| For a Year | 3 Vols. | " | <i>One Guinea.</i> |
| " In the Country | 4 Vols. | " | <i>One Guinea.</i> |

II. For Families in the Country and for Book Clubs.

| | | | |
|------------------|----------|---|----------------------|
| For a Year | 25 Vols. | " | <i>Five Guineas.</i> |
|------------------|----------|---|----------------------|

Special arrangements can be made for Book Clubs where recent publications are not required.

III. For Casual Readers who pay in advance :

Threepence—1 Vol. at a time, which may be kept a week.

IV. For all who do not pay in advance :

Sixpence for 1 Vol. at a time, and Postage Expenses incurred in recovering Arrears.

**REGISTERS FOR GOVERNESSES, AND OTHERS
REQUIRING SITUATIONS.**

The Managers of St. Joseph's Library have also for some time opened a Register for Catholic Governesses, and are in constant communication with families seeking the services of such ladies. They also receive the names of servants wanting employment, and keep a list of vacant situations. *No fees whatever are charged, except for postage.*

d
n
e
s.

Immediately.

NEW VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY SERIES.

The Life of Mother Mary Teresa Ball.

FIRST SUPERIOR OF THE IRISH BRANCH OF THE INSTITUTE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE. Price 7s. 6d.

The Life of Alfred the Great.

By the Rev. ARTHUR G. KNIGHT, S.J., Author of the "Life of Christopher Columbus." Price 6s.

The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.

Edited by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Second Edition. Price 3s. 6d.

The Manna of the Soul.

Meditations for every Day in the Year. By Father SEGNERI, S.J. Four Vols. Price 29s.

Vol. 1. January—March. Price 6s. 6d. Vol. 2. April—June. Price 7s. 6d. Vol. 3. July—September. Price 7s. 6d. Vol. 4. October—December. Price 7s. 6d.

LONDON :

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET & PATERNOSTER ROW.

ST. JOSEPH'S LIBRARY, 48, SOUTH STREET, W.

WORKS BY THE REV. H. J. COLERIDGE.

The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.

Vol. I. 7s. 6d. Vol. II. 10s. 6d.

Vita Vitæ Nostræ Meditantibus Proposita.

Cloth, 7s. 6d. ; calf, 10s. 6d.

The Life of our Life : a Harmony of the Gospels.

In Two Vols. Price 15s.

The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Vol. I. "THE MINISTRY OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST." Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

Vol. II. "THE PREACHING OF THE BEATITUDES." Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

Vol. III. "THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT." 6s. 6d.

Vol. IV. "THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT" (concluded). 6s. 6d.

Vol. V. "THE TRAINING OF THE APOSTLES" (Part I.). 6s. 6d.

The Chronicle of St. Anthony of Padua.

"THE ELDEST SON OF ST. FRANCIS." In Four Books. Price 5s. 6d.

LONDON :

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET AND PATERNOSTER ROW.

ST. JOSEPH'S LIBRARY, 48, SOUTH STREET, W.

PRIZE MEDAL.—INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1862.

Under the patronage of His Eminence the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

JURORS' REPORTS—WAX AND CHURCH CANDLES—EXCELLENCE OF QUALITY.

HIS LATE EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

In a letter addressed to FRANCIS TUCKER and Co., on the subject,

WAX CANDLES WITH PLAITED WICKS, says: "I have found them fully equal to the recommendation you gave them, and can sincerely, in my turn, recommend them to the clergy for the use of the altar."

Finest quality, with Plaited Wick, patented, 2s. 2d. per lb. Second quality, ditto, 2s. per lb.

Two Pence per lb. charged extra if a credit be taken over Three Months.

PRIZE MEDAL, VEGETABLE CANDLES.

Best quality, 1s. 5d. per lb. Second quality, 1s. 3d. per lb. Third quality, 1s. 1d. per lb.

One Penny per lb. charged extra if a credit be taken over Three Months.

Carriage paid to the nearest country Railway Station on Orders not less than Five Pounds in value.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.,

South Molton Street, Grosvenor Square. Manufactory: Kensington (Established 1730). The only Catholic Establishment in England for the Manufacture of Wax Candles for the use of the Altar.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

BIRKBECK BANK, SOUTHAMPTON BUILDINGS, CHANCERY LANE.
Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts.

The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per cent. Interest, repayable on demand.

The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares.

Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

31st March, 1880.

The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Four Millions.

HOW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY.

HOW TO PURCHASE A PLOT OF LAND FOR FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, may be had on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

MONTH AND CATHOLIC REVIEW.

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER, 1880.

ARTICLES, &c. :—

1. When George the Fourth was King. No. III. *By Percy Fitzgerald.*
2. Lancashire Forfeited Estates in 1715. The Butlers of Rawcliffe. *By the Rev. T. E. Gibson.*
3. The National Schools of Ireland and Christian Education. *By H. Bellingham.*
4. An Archbishop of Paris. Part the First. *By the Rev. A. G. Knight.*
5. "Creature Worship." Part the First.
6. Three Yorkshire Abbeys. *By G. Goldie.*
7. Passages from the Life of a Yorkshire Lady. Part the Second.
Chap. I.—"The Painted Life."
" II.—Some Scenes in the Strand in 1609.
" III.—The disappointed Nobleman.

CATHOLIC REVIEW.

I.—Reviews.

1. The Anglican Ministry; its nature and value in relation to the Catholic priesthood. An Essay by Arthur Wollaston Hutton, M.A., of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.
2. Conférences d'Angleterre. Par Ernest Renan, de l'Académie Française.
3. Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period. By S. Hubert Burke. Vol. II.
4. St. Francis of Assisi. By the Rev. F. Léopold de Chérancé, of the Order of Friars Minors Capuchins. Translated from the French by R. F. O'Connor.
5. A Forbidden Land. Voyages to the Corea. By Ernest Oppert.
6. Manuel de la Langue Assyrienne. Par M. Joachim Ménant. I. Le Syllabaire. II. La Grammaire. III. Choix des Lectures.
7. Memoir of Gabriel Beranger, and his labours in the Cause of Irish Art and Antiquities from 1760—1780. By Sir William Wilde, M.D.
8. Intimations of Holy Scripture as to the State of Man after Death. By the Rev. W. H. Karslake, M.A.

II.—Notices.

All Advertisements to be sent to Messrs. BURNS and OATES, 17 Portman Street, W.

JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY,

BIRMINGHAM,

Metal Workers in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron,

GAS FITTERS,

ENGRAVERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES,

Artists in Stained Glass and Mural Decorators,

Medallists, &c.

MESSRS. J. HARDMAN AND CO. having lately rebuilt their Show Rooms in London, and made considerable improvements and additions to them, have now a much larger stock of Art Metal Work on view, of which they respectfully invite an inspection from Architects and all who are interested in Ecclesiastical Art.

LONDON ADDRESS:

13, KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

AGENTS:

BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

When George the Fourth was King. No. III.

AT this time, Mr. Canning began to appear upon the scene; but it was to be expected that such an intellect as his was, even when he affected by resignation to efface himself, should let its force be felt. Lord Liverpool, over whom he exercised an extraordinary influence, seemed to look for the first opportunity to get his aid once more; and when Lord Sidmouth, in June, 1821, proposed retiring, and there was to be a re-distribution of offices, he suggested to the King "that the first offer must be made to Mr. Canning, whom he proposed to place at the Admiralty." The King, however, who liked nursing his resentments and giving effect to them, as a mode of adding to his importance, declined to make any change. This led to a regular discussion, in which the point was pressed on the King, to his great annoyance. As he (Lord Liverpool) had just lost his wife, the Cabinet took the matter in hand. In a conversation with Lord Sidmouth, his Majesty explained that "he did not mean to proscribe Mr. Canning altogether, nor to express his determination to exclude him for ever from the Cabinet; he only begged not to have him pressed on him at present, not being prepared, on the sudden, to give him that full confidence which a Cabinet Minister had a right to expect; that he had nothing like enmity to Mr. Canning; that, on the contrary, if Mr. Canning should attend the levée, he would receive him with the greatest civility; and that, if Mr. Canning had other objects, he would gladly promote them."

That he had resentment was only too certain; and he later declared that "he had made a vow" never to admit him. Mr. Canning's secretary tells us that the cause of this dislike was, not his share in opposition to the prosecution of the Queen, but the conduct of his supporters in the House of Lords, who, though followers of the Government, had thought it right to take his course. The King, however, attributed it to his instigation.

Lord Liverpool, however, in his bereavement, urged the

point, and to his friends commented bitterly on the unworthy pretexts urged. It was proscription, he said. The objection was "one of personal pique and resentment." "But you must know," he wrote to a friend, "what has been passing behind the scenes." This feeling on the part of the King "has been the cause of all our past errors." He even charged him with a secret scheme for destroying the Government when the opportunity offered. If the King persisted, "he must look out for another Minister." The King, ever fertile in resources, then affected to be eager to have Lord Sidmouth with him on his journey to Ireland, which would postpone the issue, and Mr. Canning himself begged that he might not be pressed; on which Lord Liverpool gave way for the present, declaring, however, that the question was only adjourned.

There was a bitterness in this discussion which the question itself does not account for, and which was really owing to a matter of a private character which had inflamed the King to an extraordinary degree. It was indeed to add to his long roll of personal feelings, and was the cause of rooted dislike which from this hour he bore to the Prime Minister. A young clergyman named Sumner had been selected as tutor by Lord Conyngham for his two sons, and had taken them abroad to Geneva. The father, it seems, had promised that an annuity or a benefice was to be the reward of his services.¹ In 1820 this pupil, Lord Francis Conyngham, had, been appointed Master of the Robes and First Groom of the Chamber to the King, whose devotion to the family was now beginning to declare itself. The pupil had often sounded his praises to his Majesty, who took as great a delight in new faces and persons that were likely to please him, as a Sultan does in favourites. His Majesty expressed a wish to see him, and he was sent for to Brighton, dined at the Pavilion, and "had a conversation of three hours, standing."

The courtiers, we are told, looked grave, but with nice forecast, told him his fortune was made. The following year, in April, 1821, a canonry at Windsor fell vacant, and the King at

¹ This arrangement naturally roused some speculation, and it was often repeated that this was only the reward for a more substantial service than merely education, in the shape of having saved his eldest charge from an improvident marriage with a young Swiss girl, by marrying her himself. This, however, it is only fair to state, has been distinctly denied by his family; and it must be said that the clergyman proved an excellent divine and bishop, with whose career so shrewd a stroke was scarcely consistent.

once named the new favourite, a young man thirty years old and a mere curate, for the canon's office. But Lord Liverpool boldly and decidedly declined to adopt this recommendation, and told the King that it "would be most injurious to his interests and give great umbrage to the Church." He added, however, that to help his Majesty out of the difficulty, he was willing to recommend the clergyman for a benefice and advance him afterwards.

The King to Lord Liverpool.

Brighton, April 13, 1821.

It is with considerable regret that the King has received Lord Liverpool's letter of yesterday, and the more as the King feels that ever since the appointment of Lord Liverpool as his First Minister he has not merely shown an uniform desire not to thwart any views of Lord Liverpool or of his friends in the disposal of the patronage of the Crown; but, on the contrary, to oblige Lord Liverpool, and to give every support in his power to an Administration created by himself, the King has yielded every personal feeling.

In illustration of which the King need only draw Lord Liverpool's attention to two very recent events amongst numberless others, namely, the removal of Lord Fife (a measure certainly painful to the King's private feelings), and the disregard of the King's desire (conveyed to Lord Liverpool through Sir Benjamin Bloomfield) "that Mr. B. Paget should succeed to the office of Receiver-General." Notwithstanding which the appointment of another individual (however eligible) took place without further reference to the King.

Under so extraordinary a proceeding did the King withhold his signature to the warrant of appointment? or did the King call upon Lord Liverpool to forfeit his promise or his word? The King might also add the instance in which he sacrificed the most painful personal feelings and opinions to the advice and earnest desire of Lord Liverpool "that the King should not accept the resignation of Mr. Canning, but suffer him to remain in his councils," in spite of the very unwarrantable conduct of that gentleman (as a member of the Cabinet) in his place in Parliament.

The question of this nomination to the vacant canonry of Windsor does not rest upon the selection which the King has made for that appointment; nor does the King doubt the sincerity of Lord Liverpool's desire to make a suitable provision in lieu of that destined by the King for Mr. Sumner. But there are principles paramount to all other considerations which will ever guide the King in his course through life. Lord Liverpool, in his desire to relieve the King from any embarrassment which the present case may occasion, appears solely to have directed his view to the policy or impolicy of this nomination, and wholly to

have disregarded that vital point of the transaction which involves the good faith and honour of his sovereign.

The King therefore sees no reason to alter his determination of appointing Mr. Sumner to the vacant canonry of Windsor; and, however willing the King might be to give up his own opinions to Lord Liverpool's wishes, it is no longer a question of the propriety of this little appointment (as the King has already stated), but whether the King's word is to be held sacred or is to be of no avail.

The King acquainted Lord Liverpool that the appointment was given by himself alone, unsolicited by —, or at the instance of any private friend of the King's or of Mr. Sumner's. His merit and his character were his only recommendations, and the King thinks such recommendations more calculated to do honour and to give satisfaction than to give "umbrage" to the Church.

Lord Liverpool in reply vindicated himself, but declined positively to change his resolution—a determination infinitely creditable to his firmness.

But it is amusing to read the excitement produced at the Castle by this contention. "If you had seen the King," wrote his pupil to the candidate, "you would have given up all your own feelings and have been entirely interested in his. I never saw anything like it. He was quite in despair." Expresses were sent to the clergyman that "he might not suffer more than could be avoided." "There never was anything which threw such a gloom of despair upon all our faces. But, as the King most kindly quoted, when he saw my agony, *Nil desperandum*, &c. You cannot conceive what he has suffered on this occasion. He is without exception the best-hearted man that ever lived." The injured but fortunate divine was at once made King's chaplain, and given a capital house at Windsor, and was informed that other arrangements were in progress. This took the shape of Librarian at Carlton House; Vicarage of St. Helen's, Abingdon; Canon of Worcester in the following year.

But the King was "mortally wounded" by the transaction, and Lord Mountcharles, with perfect truth, declared "he would never forget it." For a more experienced judge, the Duke of Wellington, writing to Lord Liverpool a little later, assured him that "the King has never forgiven your opposition in the case of Sumner. This feeling has influenced every action of his life in relation to his Government from that moment; and, I believe, to more than one of us he avowed that his objection to Mr. Canning was, that his accession to the Government was peculiarly desirable to you. Nothing can be more unjust or more

unfair than this feeling; and, as there is not one of your colleagues who did not highly approve of what you did respecting Sumner, so there is not one of them who would not suffer with you all the consequences of that act."

What a picture of weakness and folly! We may smile at the scene at Windsor—the *camarilla's* "agony," the agitated King, and the whole worked up by the courtiers and flatterers into a tempest. The lucky divine was consoled by being made Librarian at Carlton House, Vicar of St. Helen's, Abingdon, Canon of Worcester in the succeeding year, Chaplain in Ordinary, Clerk of the Closet, and three years later was offered the bishopric of Jamaica. But here he hesitated, and consulted the excellent Knighton, as to its being acceptable to his Majesty, owning, however, that he would "be heartless and profligate" to overlook such objections as the health of his little children, &c. However, he went down to see the King, who declared he would leave him "unbiassed." The King indeed said he was advancing in years, and did not now easily attach himself to new faces: he must now expect many and frequent illnesses, "when it was a satisfaction to him to know that I was at hand, that I suited him, *that he had other views for me.*" In short, he felt it a duty to comply with the King's wishes. "I hope," wrote Mr. Sumner to his lady, "you know and think how the King deserves to be loved. He could not talk of the possibility of my leaving England, *without shedding tears. He behaved most beautifully.* In the meantime, I am quite sure it is better, spiritually speaking, to have been ready and desirous to go; *temporarily speaking, it may be better for me to stay.*"

And so it was to prove with singular rapidity. The following year a stall at Canterbury was offered by Lord Liverpool, who nicely suggested that "it would in no way *interfere* with any further promotion;" on which his Majesty suggested that "he should be the next bishop," which Sir W. Knighton declared was done by the King in the most agreeable way. "So now, my dear friend," writes the physician, "you may begin to do everything as if you were at this moment a bishop. Be so good as to get rid of your shirt-frill and your trowsers. It is the King's wish you should immediately take your Doctor's degree."

Next year he became Bishop of Llandaff. But this was a poor Welsh thing, so the year after the fortunate divine received the following from his patron.

The King to the Bishop of Llandaff.

My dear Bishop,—The very moment I was informed of the death of the Bishop of Winchester, I nominated you his successor. In doing this I have not only consulted what is most agreeable to my own feelings, but what my conscience tells me will be most beneficial to the see of Winchester, and also for the good of the Church in general.

Yours sincerely,

Royal Lodge, November 18, 1827.

G. R.

The following year his brother became Bishop of Chester!² When the King returned from Hanover, a new plan for disposing of Mr. Canning released the King from the prospect of having his services forced upon him. There was a plan for sending him as Governor-General to India. Lord Hastings had signified his wish—in an informal way, as it proved—to be released from that office, and the Directors were willing to offer it to Mr. Canning. The King, to use his father's expression, had "jumped" at this solution. He was so eager indeed, that when it was found that Lord Hastings's resignation was a sort of vicarious one, and full of difficulties to act upon, the King pressed it, and insisted it should be handed to the Directors. In his eagerness he had even declared that otherwise he should have found no objection to receiving Mr. Canning among his Ministers. It, however, came to nothing, as the resignation was found to be inoperative. Meanwhile the offices had been filled up by recruits from the Grenville section of the Opposition, all pro-Catholics, and the King might congratulate himself on his adroit management. As Canning wrote bitterly, he was in the position of having declined India, which was not vacant, "and there has been no other proposal made to me since this failure. The last, I presume everybody will attribute (as I do in my own mind) to the unaltered resentment of the King."³

On Sunday, September 1, his Majesty reached Greenwich, on his trip to Scotland, where he was received with popular demonstrations.

It was curious however that, as on his Irish trip so here, his enjoyment was to be marred by a death which brought him much anxiety and inconvenience. When the ship was lying at anchor in Leith Roads, Mr. Peel arrived, who had been despatched by Lord Liverpool with the news of Lord Londonderry's death by

² The particulars will be found in the *Life of Bishop Sumner*, published a few years ago.

³ Stapleton's *Canning and his Times*, p. 326.

his own hand. This deplorable event took place on the Monday, two days after the King's departure. As in so many cases, it turned out that, after the event, many persons declared that they had forecasted the matter, among whom was the King himself. Lord Londonderry was about setting forth for the Congress, and had gone to take leave of the King, who remarked on his state, after the interview, so that when Mr. Peel was breaking the news to him at Leith, he said with some sagacity, "I know you are come to tell me Lord Londonderry is dead." So early as August 3, at a large dinner at his own house, when some one called to him from the end of the table, he started up in a strange wild manner. He had been complaining of overwork and responsibility.

As we have said, this death threatened serious annoyance for the King. He, as his Ministers also, felt that Mr. Canning alone must fill the vacancy. Lord Liverpool suggested that the matter should stand over till the Scotch junketting should be concluded. Lord Liverpool was probably not sorry that the occupations of a different kind to which his Majesty was pledged for the next week or two would give him time gradually to accustom his mind to the contemplation of what he himself must have seen to be so desirable as to be almost unavoidable; and, therefore, in his first communication proposed to postpone all discussions on the subject till the King should return to London. The King's reply approved the delay.

The King to Lord Liverpool.

Private.

Royal George Yacht, Leith Roads,

August 15, 1822.

Dear Lord Liverpool,—I cannot express the painful grief which I feel at your melancholy communication; melancholy indeed, both for myself and others who knew the inestimable value of this superior and excellent person.

The ways of Providence are so inscrutable to us poor blind creatures that, on occasions of this description, the agony of one's mind is lost in amazement. You, my lord, will not be surprised that I should feel this. I think you have judged rightly in not coming, and I quite approve that no arrangements should be thought of till my return to town.

Your sincere friend,

GEORGE R.

P.S.—I write one word more, to desire that you will favour no intentions respecting the blue ribbon.

But, as Mr. Yonge says, a couple of days afterwards he followed up his first letter by a second, showing a curious desire to elude the proposal which he foresaw must be made to him, by getting Canning, if possible, out of the way before it could be mentioned.

The same to the same.

Most private.

Dalkeith Palace, August 17, 1822.

Dear Lord Liverpool,—Notwithstanding the hurry and agitated confusion in which I am necessarily kept, yet, as you may suppose, I cannot help considering very deeply the distress and embarrassment in which my Government must be placed by the death of my esteemed and valued friend Lord Londonderry.

The immediate object of my writing to you this letter is not to make any proposal at present with a view of supplying the lamentable void produced by the untimely death of this excellent statesman, but to desire that you will not interrupt, and on no account impede the arrangements which are already settled respecting India, as it is my decision that they should remain final and unalterable.

I am induced to say thus much to you for the purpose of guarding you against any new negotiation with the individual in question.

Believe me, your sincere friend always,

G. R.

Mr. Peel to Lord Liverpool.

Most private.

Edinburgh, August 20, 1822.

Dear Lord Liverpool,—I think it right, at least it will be a satisfaction to my mind, to mention to you something which passed with the King yesterday.

On going into the closet to him before the addresses were presented, he said to me, "I will now tell you what I purposely postponed telling you until forty-eight hours after I had done it, that I have written to Lord Liverpool informing him that it is my decided intention that all the arrangements with respect to India should remain as they were settled before Lord Londonderry's death, and that there should be no delay in completing them." The King added, "I hope you think I have done right." I replied that I was sensible of his kindness in not having previously mentioned his intention to write to you, and that I hoped he would excuse me if I declined giving any opinion upon the subject of his letter to you, or saying a word upon any point connected with it.

Believe me, dear Lord Liverpool,

Yours most truly,

ROBERT PEEL.

The King to Lord Eldon.

Royal George Yacht, Leith Roads,

August 15, $\frac{1}{2}$ pt. 8 p.m., 1822.

My dear Friend,—I have this moment heard from Liverpool of the melancholy death of his and my dear friend, poor Londonderry. On Friday was the last time I saw him: my own mind was then filled with apprehensions respecting him, and they have, alas! been but too painfully verified. My great object, my good friend, in writing to you to-night, is to tell you that I have written to Liverpool, and I do implore of you not to *lend yourself* to any arrangement *whatever*, until my return to town. This, indeed, is Lord Liverpool's own proposal; and as you may suppose, I have joined *most cordially* in the proposition. It will require the most *prudent foresight* on my part relative to the new arrangements that must now necessarily take place. You may easily judge of the state of my mind. Ever believe me,

Your sincere friend,

G. R.

It will thus be seen that the King fancied that this transparent artifice, this affected eagerness, that the arrangements of the late Secretary should be carried out, would escape observation.

When the King returned to town, however, a very serious struggle began, and he showed that he was determined to resist the introduction into his Cabinet of the person he so disliked. The Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, who was at this time ill, and the Cabinet generally, with the exception of the Chancellor, felt that there was no other course to be taken. They were, moreover, aided by Lady Conyngham's influence, who was eager for this appointment. It was lamentable to find the King invariably taking issue on matters where resistance was idle; but there are weak minds which are deluded into supposing that such a struggle in which they are worsted is a victory instead of a humiliation. He had some reliance on the Duke of Wellington, to whom he despatched Sir W. Knighton for advice and consultation, "the gentleman," the Duke tells him, "whom the King had been so kind as to send to him." To him he gave the most substantial and sensible reasons for submission, based on his great talents, his opinions being in the main the same as those of the Government. As to the Chancellor's objections, if Canning had spoken harshly of him, so had he of Canning. As to the King's feelings, the Duke addressed his Majesty in this bold and manly strain: "Then your Majesty's feelings. Your Majesty conceives that Mr.

Canning has offended you, and that your Majesty's honour requires that you should resent this offence. If it were a case between two individuals, they should lay aside their private feelings for the good of the public. But when it came to be a point between the King and one of his subjects, then the honour of your Majesty consists in acts of grace and mercy, and I am convinced that your Majesty's honour is most safe in extending your grace and favour to Mr. Canning."

The King to the Duke of Wellington.

Carlton House, September 5, 1822.

My dear Friend,—I was very glad to learn by the *friend* whom I sent to your bedside yesterday, that you were rather better, and I hope that I shall have your further amendment confirmed by him to-day.

He gave me a most faithful and detailed account of your opinion and kind feelings under the painful embarrassment in which we are at present placed; and I must confess that it has produced a stronger conviction on my mind than anything that has been previously urged by others. If I could get over that which is so *intimately connected* with my *private honour*, all might be well; but how, my friend, is that to be effected? I have a perfect reliance in your dutiful affection towards me as your Sovereign; I have the most unbounded confidence in your sentiments of regard towards me as your friend; my reliance therefore in you is complete. I am with great truth,

Your's affectionate,

G. R.

The King to the Duke of Wellington.

Carlton House, September 7, 1822.

Mr dear Friend,—If you are quite well enough to come out to-day, of course I shall be most anxious to see you; but let me desire of you in the strongest manner not to leave your room at any hazard.

I have written to Lord Liverpool to say I shall defer my interview with him until I shall have had the pleasure of seeing you. My friend whom I again send with this, will receive from you, in the interim, any new sentiments or opinions that further reflection may have induced you to form on the painful subject under consideration. I am most sensibly impressed with your dutiful and affectionate attention to my interests and happiness. Believe me, with great truth,

Your affectionate,

G. R.

The Chancellor, whose principle office seemed to be deluding him into the most extraordinary compromises, had talked of resigning. He now, however, found himself alone in the

Cabinet in his opposition. His explanation of his situation to the Duke of Wellington is truly amusing, and it is needless to say the episode is lightly touched in Mr. Twiss' biography. "I saw the King," he writes to the Duke, "this morning (September 8), and he was inclined to tell me what he was about to tell Lord Liverpool and to ask my advice. I stated that it was not proper for me to give advice on a thing that I did not concur in. I could not induce myself to act according to the advice you gave me this morning. In truth, I know not how any person who has seen the King in the distress in which I have seen him during this week, has heard what has fallen from his lips during this week, could in any way further this measure." At the same time he owns that the Duke's words "had led to *some improvement* in my own conduct." He would like to see him again!

The King to Lord Liverpool.

Private.

Carlton House, September 8, 1822.

Dear Lord Liverpool,—I send you the enclosed note; by this you will see that I have sacrificed my private feelings, as you and other members of the Cabinet have represented to me that it is what you consider to be for the good of the public service. I have on every occasion, as in this instance, shown my regard and sincerity towards my Government, and I therefore look with confidence to a similar return. This is the greatest sacrifice of my opinions and feelings that I have ever made in my life.

Believe me, your sincere friend,

G. R.

Carlton House, September 8, 1822.

The King has given the fullest consideration to the proposition submitted by Lord Liverpool relative to the admission of Mr. Canning into the King's Government.

The King has always been justly impressed with the value of Mr. Canning's talents, and the King had taught himself to believe that such talents might, and ought to have been exercised for the benefit of his sovereign and his country.

When Mr. Canning thought proper to tender his resignation to the King, and to retire from the King's councils, the King expressed to Mr. Canning his regret that the country was to be deprived of his services.

It was at this period of time that the King had reason to view with surprise the line of conduct which Mr. Canning then, and afterwards, thought proper to adopt.

The King forbears to enter into details; the King is aware that

the brightest ornament of his crown is the power of extending grace and favour to a subject who may have incurred his displeasure.

The King therefore permits Lord Liverpool to propose Mr. Canning's re-admission into the Government, and the King desires that the communication may be made to Mr. Canning by the transmission of this note.

G. R.

Lord Liverpool to the King.

Private.

Coombe Wood, September 8, 1822.

Lord Liverpool has this moment had the honour of receiving your Majesty's letter, and he feels himself *quite overcome with the generosity and goodness manifested by your Majesty*, in the sacrifice which your Majesty has condescended to make of your personal feelings, to the consideration of what has been humbly represented to your Majesty by so many of your confidential servants, as the advantage of the public service.

Your Majesty may most fully rely upon the deep impression which this act of confidence and kindness of your Majesty cannot fail to make upon the mind of Lord Liverpool, and of all those with whom your Majesty has been graciously pleased to communicate upon this most trying occasion.

Lord Liverpool will, in obedience to you Majesty's commands, communicate to Mr. Canning your Majesty's letter, by which your Majesty has been graciously pleased to consent to his admission into your Majesty's service.

Lord Liverpool was "quite overcome by the generosity and goodness" of his Majesty. But it is curious to find that not until three days later, and after an interview, did he communicate the King's letter to Canning;⁴ while the latter did not send his reply to his Majesty for yet two more days. The King's letter is dated September 8th, and Canning's reply the 13th. The meaning of this delay in Mr. Canning's case was not, as Mr. Yonge supposes, from a disinclination to resign his Indian appointment, but from indignation. He took particular offence at the words "grace and favour," as did also his wife,

⁴ Lord Liverpool's doubts in sending the King's letter, are shown in his own to Canning. He urged on him "that after the severe calamity which the King and the country have sustained, and under all the circumstances of the present crisis, a sense of public duty must preclude you from making any difficulty as to taking your part in the councils of the King's Government at home at this time. I know enough of his Majesty's disposition and magnanimity to be satisfied that, however his feelings may have been wounded by some past occurrences, the causes of which have now gone by, he would never have consented to admit you, or any one, into his councils, unless he had determined to afford to the individual the fullest confidence that might be necessary for the discharge of the important duties of the high and arduous situation which he might be called upon to fill."

and he wrote an angry reply to Lord Liverpool, which he intended should be shown to the King. However, Mr. Charles Ellis and Lord Granville on hearing of this hurried to him, and by the most earnest arguments succeeded in dissuading him from sending the document.

Mr. Canning to the King.

Gloucester Lodge, September 13, 1822.

Mr. Canning apprehends that it might be considered as disrespectful to the King to omit taking notice of the letter from his Majesty to Lord Liverpool, which Lord Liverpool was specially directed to transmit to Mr. Canning.

Mr. Canning therefore acknowledges, with all thankfulness and humility, the King's spontaneous signification of his Majesty's "grace and favour," and he is particularly grateful for his Majesty's great condescension in specifying the precise period of time at which Mr. Canning had the misfortune to "incur his Majesty's displeasure," as he is confident that, if he were not restrained by his Majesty's declared wish from entering into details, he could make it clear that in the transactions of that period he had not the remotest intention of giving any offence to his Majesty.

Mr. Canning has only further to express his humble acknowledgments to his Majesty for the confidence so generously manifested in the very nature of the proposal which his Majesty has authorized Lord Liverpool to make to him; a confidence which it will be Mr. Canning's earnest and constant endeavour to deserve.

There is something ironical in the quotation of the words "grace and favour," and the affected gratitude. The King, however, does not appear to have been informed of the real reason for the delay, which he was surprised at.

The King to the Duke of Wellington.

Carlton House, 4 p.m., September 13, 1822.

My dear Friend,—I am glad to find, by my friend, that you are better to-day: and I hope and trust that the indisposition is nearly over.

Lord Liverpool has just been with me, and the affair respecting Canning may be considered as concluded. The reason given for the delay was what you kindly sent to me this morning, viz., the sentiment expressed relative in my letter, which either you or I should have settled in five minutes. I was glad to find there was no other crotchet or proposition behind. This ends the last calamity: my reliance is on you, my friend; be watchful therefore. God bless you.

Your sincere friend,

G. R.

It always seemed a little mysterious why the King, after so indulgently condoning Mr. Canning's behaviour on the

Queen's trial, should have taken offence at his conduct in the later proceedings connected with it. But Mr. Greville, who is generally well-informed, heard from an intimate friend of Canning's that the resentment was owing to the payments for the Milan Commission, which Lord Londonderry promised should be charged to the State, but which Canning insisted should be defrayed by the King himself.

All being thus happily composed, an interview with the King followed, of which Mr. Canning says coldly, "I have reason to be contented with the King's behaviour at our first interview; and I have learned from good authority that his Majesty professed to have been 'pleased and satisfied' with mine." It is amusing to hear the King's account. He told Madame de Lièven "that having consented to receive him, he behaved, as he always did, in the most gentlemanlike manner he could, and that on delivering the seals to him, he said to him that he had been advised by his Ministers that his abilities and eloquence rendered him the only fit man to succeed to the vacancy which Lord Londonderry's death had made, and that in appointing him, he had only to desire that he would follow in the steps of his predecessors."⁵ There was something clever in this speech.

This admirable Foreign Minister was to raise his country to a high position abroad, by his fearless resolute conduct in his dealings with the shiftily representatives of other countries. He was not to be trifled with. Almost at once he had to exert this excellent influence, owing to the revolt of the Spanish colonies and the invasion of Spain by France. In all the incidents connected with these transactions, the sympathies of the King were strongly for Absolutism. He was particularly affected by the order in Council, in November, against exporting arms to Spain. "I never," says the Duke, "saw him more disturbed." After he had gone to bed, some fresh despatches arrived. He sent again for the Duke, and eagerly detailed modifications in the Ministerial plans. It was unfortunate indeed that his "feelings" and prejudices were to be perpetually obstructing the plans of his Ministers, who must have found it the most troublesome of their duties to encounter them.

When, however, Lord Liverpool was struck down by apoplexy, the question arose who was to be Prime Minister. The struggle that followed is well known, as well as the

⁵ Greville, vol. i. p. 56.

difficulties in the way of a pro-Catholic Premier such as Canning would be. The result was that Mr. Canning left, bearing with him a message to the Cabinet to the effect that the King desired a Prime Minister of the same principles as Lord Liverpool. Mr. Peel, however, had seen the King a day later, and brought a message to his colleague, that he might use his discretion as to communicating the message, on which both Ministers agreed that it was inadvisable, and the matter was let to drop.

The Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel had interviews, in which the situation was discussed; but it would seem that these were of a very general character, nor do we know whether any arrangements were proposed, though the result was most warm and cordial praise of Peel's frankness and straightforwardness. On the Duke's side there was some coldness. But they had several interviews: one on the 3rd of April, in which Mr. Canning recounted in fullest detail all that had taken place with the King. "Everything in doubt between them," wrote Canning to Knighton, "has been cleared up, and we parted as you could have wished—all being left well." The meaning of this Mr. Greville helps us to understand, he having the account from so excellent an authority as Mr. Arbuthnot, the Duke's confidential friend. It seems that the King, in an interview with the Duke, had incautiously repeated to him what, he said, Canning had told him, that "if the Tories would not agree to his being Prime Minister, he was sure of the Whigs"—an assurance given to the indiscreet monarch under seal of secrecy. This matter is of course not set down in the minute, but was due to misapprehension, or perhaps to the imagination of the King. The Duke answered indignantly that he already knew of Mr. Canning's tamperings with the Whig section of the Cabinet, and that he would never agree to his being Prime Minister, as he had no confidence in him. When matters did not advance, it was seen at the Court how this revelation had disturbed all the negotiations, and Knighton was despatched to arrange or patch up matters and a fresh interview between the Duke and Mr. Canning. Both accordingly met, and in a long interview of two hours all subjects were discussed but the all-important one, to which Mr. Canning made not the slightest allusion. Mr. Arbuthnot was grievously disappointed at this result, and attributed it to Canning's pique at a proposal which Mr. Peel had made of the Duke's becoming the head of the Government. But the truth was, all parties were guarding

themselves, and feinting, waiting for the others to speak. Indeed Canning, in his letter of the 5th of April, says he had had another long talk with Peel, than which nothing could be more satisfactory as to manner and feeling. But the practical point, as to his own decision, remains just where it was: "and I am quite confident will remain so until *I can speak to him positively, not hypothetically*. I have also had a few more words with the Duke, but equally without any advance." He now saw indeed that there was a hope that matters would end in the King's begging the Duke to take the Government.⁶ On the 9th a formal proposal came from Peel, whom he met by direction of the King, that the Duke should take the Government, and thus solve all difficulties. This being refused, the fluctuating King—who had made this faint effort—at once yielded, and directed Mr. Canning to prepare, with as little delay as possible, a plan for the reconstruction of the Government.

Nor was it wonderful that the King felt a dread of taking such a step, for the "Protestant friends of the Constitution" did not shrink from intimidating him. The Duke of Newcastle came to warn him, in almost threatening language, having the right to an audience, that having held himself out as a "Protestant Prince," and as having always been one, he could not complain if his supporters were alarmed or disgusted.

The King to Sir William Knighton.

Dear Friend,—For God's sake, for all our sakes, pray, pray take care of yourself, and do not think, upon any account, of stirring until to-morrow morning. It is true, I am jaded and quite worn out, and writing from my bed, where I have laid down for a little rest; but to-morrow will be quite time enough. Little or no advance, I regret to say, has as yet been made, amidst, perhaps, almost unravelable perplexities.

Yours affectionately,

G. R.

St. James's Palace, Friday, April 6, 1827.

The quarrel that followed is familiar to all. The Duke, when applied to to join the Government, affected not to know who was to be the head of it, Canning retorting with what the other considered to be a rebuke, in which the King's name was introduced without any warrant. Though the Duke affected to

⁶ Greville, vol. ii. p. 171. This writer's accuracy is quite vindicated by the account given by Mr. Stapleton, *Canning and his Times*, p. 588.

disclaim all claim to the headship of the Government, there can be no doubt that he expected to be invited to take the leadership.⁷ The real ground was certainly his distrust, and perhaps suspicion, of Canning, founded on a mutual lack of sympathy. He suspected that he, the Duke, had been sent to Moscow to get him out of the way,⁸ and there was certainly a pettiness in the mode of showing this feeling, such as in studiously addressing him in letters, "My dear Mr. Canning." It must be said, however, that he believed that he had been deceived, and declared that on the 2nd of April (at one of their cordial conversations), Canning had told him that one of his designs was "to propose Robinson as First Lord." "I believe," he wrote in strong language to Lord Bathurst, "the whole system is founded upon fraud, to which I believe the King is willing quietly to submit. But both he and Mr. Canning knew that it could not be carried on while I was in office without his Majesty knowing of it. Therefore I was to be hurried out."⁹

The King through all these transactions had shown his usual weakness and trimming, wishing to pose as a "Protestant" sovereign, and yet not having the courage to withstand the influence of a powerful and commanding character. It must be said, too, that his inert nature shrank from the worry and contention which he foresaw the rejection of Canning would entail upon him. As his old friend Lady Hertford said of him at this time, he was "always led by the last person he saw," and whose opinions he adopted with a vehemence which only added to the amazement of the visitor on finding that the very opposite of his counsels had been adopted. Thus he was now consulting every one, and making all kinds of assurances in the most opposite senses. It will be entertaining to review his share in the transaction. As we have seen before the change came he was loud in professions of stanch orthodoxy to the Duke of Newcastle, who came to warn him; made a valiant display, "entered at great length into the whole history of the Roman Catholics from the reign of James the Second down to the present time, professed himself a Protestant heart and soul,"

⁷ Both argued with some ingenuity on the same ground, that the continuity of Lord Liverpool's premiership should be maintained: Canning urging that the exclusion of a "Catholic" Premier violated the "open question" compact; while the Duke urged Lord Liverpool's precedent as a reason for appointing some one of the same description.

⁸ Greville, vol. ii. p. 173.

⁹ *Duke of Wellington's Des. Cor. et Mem.* vol. iii. Letter April 15.

He declared he never would give his assent to any measures for Roman Catholic Emancipation. And, when pressed by the Duke as to the new form of his Administration, he assured the Duke "that the First Minister should be for the Protestant side of the question," and, as to Ireland, that the Chancellor there should be Protestant also. He added that the present audience would be necessarily known to everybody; but "he must keep faith with his Ministers." He said "the courage of his family had never been questioned." When assured that, in choosing Protestants for his Ministers, his choice would be supported by a large and powerful body of Peers, and pressed for an assurance that his choice would be made accordingly, he said, again and again, "Do you doubt me? But it is not I who fail in my duty. It is you in Parliament. Why do you suffer the d——d Association in Dublin?" The King's sentiments were strongly expressed, but there was reason to apprehend that considerations of ease and repose might outweigh his principles.

The Duke told the King plainly that the support or opposition of himself, and of those for whom he was acting, would depend on the choice that the King should finally make in forming his Administration.

In parting, the King very graciously told him "he never need ask an audience *in form*, he was always welcome," and hoped he would come and fish there in the summer.

(N.B. The King did not finish the audience without talking to the Duke about his *tailor*.)¹⁰

The Archbishop of Canterbury he entertained in the same way on the 14th, for six hours, from two till eight. Here he was still more earnest, going back to Mr. Fox's time, and that of "the Talents." In this discourse he exhibits some of the curious delusions into which he had persuaded himself, viz., that of having been a devoted son. He had induced Mr. Fox not to bring forward the Catholic question to disturb his father, who would never consent, nor would he, if the crown descended to him. "When the Grenville's were dismissed in 1807, it was he that had given early notice of the pro-Catholic scheme to his father," &c. As to the new Government,

He particularly mentioned, as to the coronation oath, that he had told Lord Castlereagh previously to his own coronation, that if they meant he should ever consent to Roman Catholic Emancipation, they must *alter* the coronation oath *before* he was crowned; for after taking that he would, like his father, sooner consent to lay his head on the block than consent to that measure. The King then desired the Archbishop to write immediately to Lord Manners, begging, as a personal request from the King, that he would stay out the year, so as to give

¹⁰ *Diary of Lord Colchester*, vol. iii. p. 473.

time for finding another Protestant Chancellor of Ireland, for he would have a Protestant Lord Lieutenant also, and a Protestant Chief Secretary. The Archbishop accordingly had written to, and had received a letter from, Lord Manners, consenting to remain till October. Yet he complained of the Duke of Wellington, declaring that he had agreed to accept with Canning.

In his Protestant principles "he was even more immoveably fixed than his father was," and when Mr. Peel told him there were no materials for a Protestant Government, he said, "Then it must be a *neutral* Cabinet. Mr. Canning is *forced* upon me; but I will have a Protestant Lord Lieutenant," &c. This latter declaration he made to all sorts of persons, and he bade the Archbishop tell it "to all the bishops, and all the world." The sagacious Lord Colchester, to whom this was related, doubted the prudence of this invitation, urging the unhappy effect produced by the King's contradictory declarations and actions. Lord Londonderry also came on the same mission, and gave him an opportunity for one of those discursive apologies and rambling monologues, by which he fancied he was neutralizing the effects of some act of weakness.

PERCY FITZGERALD.

*Lancashire Forfeited Estates in 1715.
The Butlers of Rawcliffe.*

THE rebellion of 1715, as far as a short-sighted humanity can pretend to judge, exercised a disastrous influence on religion, especially as regards the counties of Northumberland and Lancashire. In both these counties many Catholics of position implicated in the outbreak suffered the loss of their estates, and in numerous cases, of both life and estate. Much Catholic blood was spilt in Lancashire, for Preston witnessed the final triumph of the King's forces. In the first flush of success scant mercy was shown to the unfortunate adherents of a cause which only wanted victory to give it the *éclat* of a glorious revolution. Those who had to encounter the judgment of native tribunals amid the scenes of recent warfare, had but a short shrift allotted to them. Others who were taken prisoners to London, had all the advantage of a removal from the theatre of war, and some interval of time to cool the passions of those who were to decide their fate. The greater number of such prisoners, though convicted and left for execution, were suffered to depart shorn of their estates and with their persons attainted. In respect to the lesser gentry the confiscation of their property resulted in absolute ruin, while in a few cases of higher rank the estates were repurchased for the families by the interposition of monied friends.

The sale of the forfeited estates was managed by seven Commissioners, who each received a salary of £1,000 per annum. From a copy of their report to Parliament, which now lies before us, it appears that their salaries and expenses absorbed the sum of £70,097 17s. 0d. As the total amount derived from the sales was £277,393 6s. 11d., it will be seen that the Commissioners secured no contemptible share of the plunder. The latter amount does not include the Derwentwater estate, which, as is well known, was awarded by Parliament for the support of Greenwich Hospital, then in a struggling condition. In 1859 the net income which it derived from this source

alone reached the large sum of £40,204 15s. Lord Widdrington's fine property in Lincolnshire and Northumberland produced by far the largest amount that figures in the tables of the Commissioners, viz., £96,525 14s. 2d. Thomas Chaplin, Esq., was the purchaser of the Lincolnshire property at the price of £32,400, and Christian Cole, Esq., became the proprietor of that in Northumberland for £57,100, while a smaller estate in Durham was sold to Joseph Banks, Esq., for £7,029 14s. 2d. Among the lesser Catholic gentry of Northumberland whose inheritances were sacrificed we find George Collingwood (£18,100), Edward Swinburne (£6,800), Thomas Errington (£1,510), Philip Hodgson (£1,192), and George Gibson (£360). In several cases the properties were partially saved by the possessor having only a life interest in his estate. The Yorkshire Catholics do not appear to have taken much share in the rising. An estate of Christopher Trappes sold for £399 15s. 11d., and the life interest of Richard Sherburne in a small property for £81. No doubt there were others, but only the Lancashire estates are given in detail in the document from which we quote. It may interest your readers to transcribe the names of those whose notions of faith and loyalty led to the sacrifice of all they possessed, and in most cases to the ruin of their posterity. The preamble to the Commissioners' Report, which is without date but must have been furnished towards the end of 1724, declares that they were appointed by several Acts of Parliament "to enquire of the estates of certain traytors and Popish recusants, and of estates given to superstitious uses, and of vesting the said forfeited estates in trustees to be sold for the use of the publick, &c." There are seven appendices to the Report giving the work of the Commissioners under various headings. The following sales of Lancashire estates are found in Appendix, No. 2.

| Date. | Name of Purchaser. | Forfeiting estate. | Interest sold. | Price. |
|----------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1718. | | | | |
| May 26. | Abraham Crompton. Put up at £4,500. | Rich. Chorley. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £255 12. | £5,550. |
| Mch. 21. | John Wicker. Put up at £4,000. | Ed. Winckley. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £227 8s. 6d. | £4,050. |
| Mch. 22. | David Fuller. Put up at £50. | Roger Dicconson, (Chambers in Grays-Inn, co. Middlesex.) | Fee simple. | £51. Less £12 paid discoverer. |

174 *Lancashire Forfeited Estates in 1715.*

| Date. | Name of Purchaser. | Forfeiting estate. | Interest sold. | Price. |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Mch. 23. | John Wicker. Put up at £750. | John Plessington. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £39 15s. 8d. | £760. |
| | Samuel Kilner. Put up at £40. | Rob. Daniel. (Lanc.) | Life estate. Ann. value £8. | £41. |
| 1719. | William Brook. Put up at £600. | Hugh Anderton. (Lanc.) | Life estate. | £605. |
| | John Wicker. Put up at £3,000. | Thos. Stanley. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £232 2s. 6d. | £3,010. |
| Dec. 18. | Josh. Briscoe. Put up at £3,500. | Ralph Standish. (Lanc.) | Life estate. Ann. value £106 12s. 1d. Rents, Boons, &c. £369 2s. 4½. improv'd rents, £720 5s. 2d. | £3,517. |
| | Thos. Winckley. Put up at £80. | Robt. Cooper. | Life estate. | £81. Less £20 paid dis- coverer. |
| Dec. 18. | Willm. Greenhalgh. Put up at £45. | John Parkinson. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £5 17s. 6d. | £46. |
| 1720. | Joseph Studley. Put up at £21. | Thomas Stanley. (House in Preston.) | Two lives. | £70. |
| May 5. | Robt. Stoddart. Put up at £700. | Gabriel Hesketh. (Lanc.) | Estate tail. Ann. value £122 12s. 3d. | £750. |
| May 6. | Robt. Stoddart. Put up at £200. | Josh. Wadsworth. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £12. | £280. |
| | Croft Corles. Put up at £600. | Thos. Walton. (Lanc.) | Life and re- version in fee, ann. val. £103 11s. 1½. | £651. |
| | Josh. Studley. Put up at £100. | Rd. Billsborough. (Lanc.) | Two lives. Ann. value £19 10. | £120. |
| | John Winkley. Put up at £5,000. | John Dalton. (Lanc.) | Life and re- version in fee, ann. val. £667 3s. 9d. | £5,055. |
| 1721. | Lewis Elstob. Put up at £900. | Rd. Shuttleworth. (Lanc.) | Fee simple. Ann. value £60. | £1,140. |
| July 13. | Lewis Elstob, Put up at £29. | Rd. Shuttleworth. (An estate called Acre Croft.) | Remainder of lease. | £30. |

The Butlers of Rawcliffe.

175

| Date. | Name of Purchaser. | Forfeiting estate. | Interest sold. | Price. |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | Edw. Stanley. | John Leyburne. | Fee simple. | £2,520. |
| | Put up at £2,400. | (Westmoreland.) | Ann. value £145. | |
| | Wm. Smith. | Thos. Stanley. | Two joint | £610. |
| | Put up at £350. | (Middlesex.) | lives. Ann. val. £122. | Less £125 19s paid dis- coverer and £106 3s. 10d for repairs. |
| 1720. | | | | |
| Dec. 15. | Josh. Studley. | John Dalton. | Fee simple. | £362. |
| | Put up at £300. | (Cheshire.) | Ann. value £13 1s. 8d. | Less £90 paid dis- coverer. |
| 1721. | | | | |
| Dec. 14. | Wm. Smith. | Thos. Breers. | Fee simple. | £2,010. |
| | Put at £1,600. | (Lanc.) | Ann. value £91 18s. | Less £310 for errors in survey. |
| | Croft Corles. | John Leyburne. | Life and reversion. | £2,421. |
| | Put at £2,000. | (Lanc.) | Ann. value £121 15s. 3½d. | |
| | Jas. Naylor. | Rich. Withington. | Fee simple. | £100. |
| | Put up at £60. | (Lanc.) | Ann. value £14 10s. | |
| 1722. | Wm. Smith, | Ralph Shuttleworth | Fee simple. | £51. |
| July 5. | Put up at £50. | (Lanc.) | Ann. value £4 5s. | |

It will be noticed from the sums specified above as paid to discoverers, that there were informers at work who gave notice to the Commissioners of concealed estates. The following particulars given in Schedule No. 6 relate to estates destined for what the law was pleased to term "superstitious uses."

| | Annual value. |
|--|---------------|
| | £ s. d. |
| In Yorkshire West Riding, in the Manor of Twistleton, two tenements | 20 0 0 |
| Rent charge for ever out of Albany Hall and lands, given by Sir R. Henry Fletcher | 13 0 0 |
| Aldcliffe Hall, Lancashire, diverse fields, &c. | 92 1 8 |
| Low House and Wragmire Head, co. Cumberland | 32 0 0 |
| Southworth Hall, co. Lancashire | 186 6 0 |
| Cockshutts, co. Lancashire | 36 0 0 |
| Improved Rents, &c., in Southworth | 21 15 2 |
| Houses in Fleet Street, London | 119 0 0 |
| Phiswick Hall, co. Lancashire | 79 10 0 |
| Eccleston Hall, co. Lancashire | 351 10 2 |
| Westerleigh tithes, Lancashire | 27 18 4 |

Some of these properties seem to have been rescued from the hands of the Commissioners by means of laymen to whom they had been confided and who were able to prove their legal right. Thus, the property described as within the manor of Twistleton, in Yorkshire, had been left by Mrs. Cansfield a short time previously as an endowment for the mission at Robert Hall. For purposes of security it was placed in the hands of the Gerards, the representatives of the Cansfields, in whose family the legal tenure still continues. The rents now form a portion of the income of Hornby, to which place the mission of Robert Hall was subsequently transferred, and which is remarkable as having been long the residence of the late Dr. Lingard. The Jesuit body succeeded in retaining or regaining possession of Southworth Hall, which they parted with by sale in 1828. Cockshutts is a small farm nearly adjoining Southworth. The West Leigh tithes are still held by the same Society as an endowment for its mission at Bedford Leigh.

With one or two exceptions the whole of the attainted persons named in the previous schedule were Catholics, who belonged to that part of Lancashire which is called the "Fylde." As many persons have very indistinct notions of the geography of this district, we may remark that it comprises one-third of the Hundred of Amounderness, but its exact boundaries cannot be easily defined owing to its being composed of irregular parishes. A line drawn from Ashton-on-the-Ribble to Churchtown-on-the-Wyre, forms the nearest approach to an eastern boundary, but there are certain points jutting over the line which belong to the Fylde. It includes the large parish of Kirkham exclusive of its outlying portions (Goosnargh with Newsham and Whittingham), and the whole of the parishes of Bispham, Lytham, Poulton, and St. Michaels. Its remarkable flatness obviously gave rise to this designation. Its inhabitants, as is well known, have been conspicuous for their fidelity to the Church in trying times. In 1582, that virulent persecutor, the Earl of Huntingdon, writing to the Bishop of Chester, says: "Good, my lord, be careful of Preston and other places in your file (fylde) country." This district was naturally the scene of contention during the Civil War, and Greenhalgh Castle, near Garstang, was garrisoned on the King's side. No doubt religion suffered greatly at that period from the exactions of the soldiery, and the sequestrations which followed the success of Parliament. Then came the rebellion of 1715, with its still

greater losses. No details have come down to us regarding what took place in Lancashire before the fatal surrender of Preston. The Pretender's adherents from the Fylde country must for the most part have joined at that town. They had hardly time to reflect upon their position when they found themselves prisoners in the hands of relentless enemies. Sir Francis Anderton was accustomed to say that for one day's "out" with the rebels, he had lost a fine estate. That marauding parties should beat up the neighbouring country in search of provisions and recruits was to be expected, but no great damage seems to have been done. The following letter from a gentleman connected with the Fylde to a friend at Little Eccleston, bears relation to this eventful period.

1715, Dec. 22, London.

I hope you have no way suffered from the plunderers, nor any of your neighbours. Pilling Moss was a good place of retreat during the seat of war in your parts. Since the prisoners have been arrived, I have been to wait upon Mr. Butler, but was denied seeing him. They are all closely confined, and what the Government will do with them is yet a secret. I cannot think them in danger of suffering, I mean in their persons. I hear they are all in good heart and have many presents sent them from unknown hands.

In Tyldesley's Diary, 1712-14, we find occasional notice of some of those who afterwards took part in the rebellion, and whose names have been already given as owners of forfeited estates. Thomas Tyldesley, the writer, was grandson to the famous Royalist leader, and was himself an intense Jacobite. He was a roystering blade, ready at all hours for amusement of any description, and not very select in the choice of his associates. He was continually on the move, amid fresh scenes and fresh faces, and must have been well known at all the ale-houses of the district. From the precise manner in which he notes down at every turn his smallest expenditure, it might be supposed that he was a careful economist, but the Diary reveals a very contrary state of things. It is clear that he was plunging himself every year into fresh difficulties, and had acquired a fatal facility in allowing interest to be added to debt, a mode of procedure which has never been found to result well. In his many severe fits of sickness he doctored himself in a wild and violent fashion, suffering himself to be bled to exhaustion, and swallowing in one "bout" as much physic as would serve a modern valetudinarian for life. It is

really marvellous that he contrived to reach the age of fifty-seven when he was buried at Garstang Church-town, as appears from the following entry in the Register: "1714-15, January 26. Thos. Tinsley, Esq., of the Lodge." The diarist lived chiefly at Fox Hall, now absorbed within the flourishing town of Blackpool, but Myerscough Lodge was his occasional residence. He was a staunch Catholic, and the entries relating to his hearing Mass on Sundays and his going to the sacraments are frequent. When at Fox Hall he often had a priest residing with him, and when at Myerscough he attended Mass chiefly at Aldcliffe, where the celebrated Dr. Hawarden was then priest. That the diarist could appreciate the learning of this admirable divine is evident from an entry made one Christmas Eve: "About 11 att night went to Aldcliffe where Dr. Harden preached gloriously." It seems to have been the custom at that period for midnight Mass to be celebrated in country places, as we find similar entries in the cotemporary diary of Nicholas Blundell of Crosby. Thomas Tyldesley's Jacobite propensities occasionally peep out of these daily records. He chides one priest for disloyalty in refusing to pray for the Pretender, and commends another who had pleased him in this respect. As it is noticeable that he was furbishing up his armour as if preparing for an outbreak, he would probably have added another victim to the fatal "fifteen" if death had not intervened. His son, however, was implicated, though he seems to have escaped conviction, and his grandson, James, was amongst the few Lancashire Catholics who participated in the later rising of 1745. The once ample estates of the Tyldesleys melted away in the hands of their improvident owners, and it is said that male representatives of this loyal house exist at this day in very impoverished circumstances.

Amongst the sufferers already enumerated, Edward Winckley, of Banister Hall, is often mentioned by the diarist, who calls him "Honest Ned Winckley." He frequently visited him and consulted him on his domestic affairs. Mr. Winckley appears to have had the means of repurchasing his estate, which, however, was finally sold by him on February 1, 1738, a few years before his death in 1742. He had a brother William, a secular priest and rural dean of Leyland, and two of his sons also entered the Church. John Plessington, of Dimples Hall, was also a neighbour and companion of Tyldesley. He was great nephew to John Plessington, a secular

priest, put to death for his religion at Chester. Mr. Tyldesley mentions hearing Mass at Dimples, so that this was one of the numerous chapels in the Fylde district closed by the rebellion. Thomas Stanley, of Great Eccleston Hall, had only lost his father the previous year, so that he did not enjoy his inheritance long. The father, "Dick Stanley," does not seem to have been in the good graces of the diarist, but the reason is evident; as a creditor, he was not sufficiently accommodating. This Stanley was descended from a natural son of Henry, Earl of Derby, who had settled at Great Eccleston in the days of Queen Elizabeth. After the forfeiture, Thomas Stanley's mother continued to reside at Great Eccleston Hall, on which she had a claim for jointure. She was of the family of Culcheth, of Culcheth, and through her the succession to this estate came to her son Thomas, on the death of his cousin, Thomas Culcheth, *s.p.* in 1747. Thomas Stanley, who had married Meliora, widow of James Poole, Esq., had an only son Richard, declared a lunatic on inquisition, and an only daughter, Meliora, on whom the Culcheth estate devolved. She married William Dicconson, but on her death without issue in 1794, the property passed by heirship to the Traffords, by whom it was afterwards sold, and is now in Protestant hands.⁹ Gabriel Hesketh is frequently named. He was of White Hill, Goosnargh, and on one occasion, after a coursing in company with the diarist, the latter complains that he and Sany (Alexander) Butler "had devoured all the pyes in the house, leaving not a mouthful to us poor pill garlicks." Another of his companions, whom he calls "Honest little Dick Shuttleworth," was probably the one whose estate was sold; another of the same name was hanged for the rebellion at Preston. He mentions going to prayers (Mass) at Aldcliffe, with his two cousins the Waltons, one of whom (Thomas) was attainted at this time. In addition to the estates already enumerated, others are named in an appendix, the sale of which had been delayed in consequence of claims having arisen, but several of these were afterwards brought to the hammer. Amongst these was the estate of William Bolton, whom we find at a merry meeting with such Jacobites as Roger Muncaster (a Protestant lawyer of Garstang, afterwards hanged for the rebellion), Joseph Wadsworth, and Thomas Goose or Gorse, who were both executed at Garstang on the same occasion.

The possessions of the Butlers of Rawcliffe were amongst

⁹ See an elaborate Pedigree of the Culcheths in Brother Foley's last volume.

these later sales, and the entry by the Commissioners gives their value thus :

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| Richard Butler's estates in Lancashire (in fee), viz., improved | | | | | |
| rents | ... | ... | ... | ... | £576 4 0 |
| Annual rents and boons | ... | ... | ... | ... | 273 3 3½ |
| | | | | | <hr/> |
| | | | | | £849 7 3½ |

This estate had now been in the hands of the Commissioners for a few years, and the difference between the old and the improved rents is very remarkable. To this we shall have occasion to revert hereafter.

Few families in Lancashire could vie with the Butlers of Rawcliffe in antiquity of descent. From Theobald Walter, the progenitor of the race, some of the noblest families of the name in Ireland, notably the Dukes of Ormond, Lords Mountgarret, Dunboyne, and Carrick, deduce a common origin. He was a son of Herveus, a companion of William the Conqueror, and on the defection of Roger de Poitou, had his large possessions conferred upon him, including Amounderness and Preston. He contributed largely to the ransom of King Richard the First, and was the munificent founder of several religious houses. The great Abbey of Arklow and Wolheny, the Hospital of St. John the Baptist, at Nenagh, in Ireland, and the Abbey of Cocker-sand, in the neighbourhood of Rawcliffe, were indebted to him for their primary establishment. He was the father of Theobald, who married in 1225, for his second wife, Roesia, daughter of Nicholas de Verdon, whose son, Theobald le Botiler, is found by an escheat of 1248 the possessor of the manor of Routhelive, in addition to other lands.

In the days of King Richard the Second, Sir John Boteler, of Rawcliffe, was High Sheriff of Lancashire, and another, John, who died *circa* 1462, was the founder of a chantry "at the aulter of the Blessed Katherine," in the Church of St. Michaels-le-Wyre. Here was the burial-place of the family, but all their monuments have disappeared. The chapel, however, still exists, and has the arms of the Butlers engraved on the stone outside. The will of Alice Butler, widow, dated November 20, 1504, is curious—

She bequeaths "her sawll to Gode and His Blessed Mother and all the holye compane of Heven, and her bodye to be beryed in Xpian wyse in Saynt Katrine her C'le, wher her husband laye ; to the lyght brenning there, 20d. ; to Thomas Walton or some well disposed priest, to synge for my sawll fore one yere, £1 13s. 4d., and solempne Mass of

Requiem and oither obsequies to be don as becometh one of my degre, but not too moche expendsive, that my executors let not (hinder not) my dowter's advancement in maryage; to Sir John Butler, clerk, 40s. a yere, togider with meat and drynke while hee is on lyfe."

The Butlers intermarried with the best county families, as those of the Booths, Townleys, Radcliffes, Molyneuxs, Sherburnes, and Standishes. They appear to have been a long-lived race. In 1667, Mr. Blundell, writing to his friend Lawrence Ireland, mentions the death of Mr. Butler of Rawcliffe, at the age of eighty-six years, after being the father of thirty-one children by two wives, and the cavalier's grandson tells us that he was known by the name of "Wrynose." A curious document shows that Richard Butler, of Rawcliffe, was looked upon as disaffected in 1689, a period at which many Lancashire Catholics were imprisoned, for fear that their sympathies might lead them to assist the dethroned monarch—

Information of Christopher Clarke, of Little Eccleston, co. Lancaster, mariner, taken at Cartford, before Ralph Longworth, justice of the peace. 1689, November 1st.

Ten days or a fortnight ago, a boy came to the waterside and told me to come over the water to Rawcliffe Hall, to speak to Mr. Richard Butler, son to Richard Butler, Esq., which I did. Mr. Butler drew me aside and told me to go to the Shard and buy a vessel for him from one Richard Tinkler, called the *Elizabeth*, of Wyre. We went together to the Shard, and I agreed, on the part of Richard Butler, to give £80 for her, and paid £10 on the spot. £20 was to be given before the vessel sailed, £50 before May-day. After the bargain was completed, Mr. Mark Lytham, of Poulton, came into the company and told me that he had freighted the vessel with salt for Belfast. I now fear there is some ill design at the bottom of it, for Richard Butler wanted me to take a cockett out of the Custom House at Lancaster, which I refused to do unless I sailed in it myself. The day after the bargain was made, the said Richard Butler came to my house with Thomas Stanley, Esq., and Richard Tinkler, where the whole agreement was rehearsed and writings drawn up.

Information of Richard Tinckler, of Poulton, co. Lancaster, sworn before Ralph Longworth, Esq., J.P. 1689, November 1st.

Was formerly owner of the *Elizabeth*, of Wyre, which was seized in Broadfleet, near the River Lune, and about ten days or a fortnight ago sold it to Christopher Clark, mariner, of Cartford, in Little Eccleston, for £80. Looks for payment from Mr. Richard Butler and the said Christopher Clark. He further saith that the said Mark Lytham is a reputed Papist, and believes he is so, for that he never saw him at the church, although he lives in the same town.

This Ralph Longworth, J.P., now so zealous for the Protestant succession, had married a Catholic lady, the sister of George Westby, of Upper Rawcliffe, Esq. We find him only two years before basking in the sunshine of a Popish Court. Writing to his wife from London on November 25, 1687, he says—

I dined yesterday at Whythall, with Mr. Vice-Chamberlayne Strickland and his lady, after he had brought me to see the King and Queen dyne. I received a very kynd welcome, and we had your health at dynner, and after he was pleased to meet mee at the tavern, when wee remembered our friends.

Amongst the items of news which he had forwarded to his wife in the previous week occurs this passage—

The Rev. Father Petre, Clerk of his Majesty's Closet, is made one of the Privy Counsell, and has taken his place accordingly, and is to sit in his Pontifical robes.

The idea of Father Petre seated in his Pontifical robes at the King's right hand, was no doubt a bugbear to the Protestant mind of this country, and did as much as anything to accelerate the revolution. Any one who had witnessed the intense bitterness displayed in 1679-80, when the banishment of all the leading Catholics of the kingdom was seriously contemplated, must have foreseen the inevitable result of the King's proceedings.

Henry Butler succeeded his father Richard, and in 1708, on the marriage of his eldest son, Richard, after providing for the payment of his debts and of certain annuities, he settled the estate upon the newly married couple, who thenceforth took up their abode at Rawcliffe Hall. He himself retired with his wife to a residence somewhere in the neighbourhood. Richard was thus Lord of Rawcliffe at the time of the rebellion, and no doubt joined the rebels at Preston, in company with Thomas Stanley, Esq., of Great Eccleston, and other neighbours. He was taken prisoner and carried to London, where he died, in the prison of Newgate, on January 16, 1716. His only child, Katharine, married Edward Markham, of Ollarton, co. Notts, Esq., but died without issue.

Henry Butler, the father, who was still living, put in a claim to the estate for himself and his wife Ann, on July 7, 1720. It was admitted, however, that the claimant and Ann his wife were Papists, and therefore by 11 and 12 William III. incapacitated

to take, and *for this reason* the estate, use, or interest limited to them was adjudged void. A further claim, made May 18, 1721, was dismissed, and this dismissal confirmed on appeal to the delegates, February 25, 1722. Thus Henry Butler, though innocent of the offence which occasioned the forfeiture, was excluded on the sole ground of the law of 11 and 12 William III., which enacted, amongst other things, that "Papists not taking the oaths in six months after eighteen years of age are declared incapable to inherit lands, &c., the next of kin, a Protestant, to enjoy the same." These were the most severe laws as affecting property, which had arisen during the whole period of persecution, and they were taken advantage of in times like these to dispossess Catholics of their estates. The only possible method of defeating them was to make a temporary act of conformity with the Established Church; but this no conscientious Catholic could do. Henry Butler was too religious a man to adopt such a course, and chose to suffer the extremity of poverty rather than deny his faith.

Another Lancashire gentleman in similar circumstances was prevailed upon to make an act of conformity, and on the very same day the estates which he had laid claim to were made over to him. Through the staunch adherence of Henry Butler to his religion, he and his wife were reduced to beggary, and the reign of this ancient race at Rawcliffe came to an end. Porter, in his *History of the Fylde*, recently published, following other writers, asserts that Henry Butler took part with his son in the rebellion of 1715. If this had been the case, it is manifest that he could never have appeared in court as a claimant. This imputation is sufficiently disproved by the fact, apparent from documents still extant, that not only were his several claims considered, but that they were rejected on the sole ground of religion.

The Rawcliffe estates were sold by the Commissioners on September 19, 1723, to the Rev. Richard Crombleholme, Vicar of St. Michael's le Wyre, Cornelius Fox and James Poole, Esqs., for £11,260. There seems to have been some understanding with Mr. Crombleholme that the tenants should have the privilege of purchasing their holdings at a price previously agreed upon. We find no fewer than eighty individuals becoming proprietors in this manner, a fact which says much for the prosperity of the district. It says more, perhaps, for the extreme indulgence with which the Butlers had for generations treated their

tenantry. This is confirmed in a remarkable manner by the Report of the Commissioners already given, from which it is shown that the returns had been far more than doubled in the few years in which they had held the estate.

And now what return does the reader suppose was made by the tenants who had been so considerably used, to their ancient lord, now reduced to poverty? They met together, and agreed to give him sixpence an acre for his subsistence, but this seems to have been only partially paid. Henry Butler was now an old man, and death soon released the purchasers from what they perhaps looked upon as a burdensome tax. His wife survived him, and she had absolutely lost everything. Her jointure was swallowed up in the estate, and the purchasers do not seem to have considered themselves bound to continue to her the allowance which they had grudgingly made to her husband. It is melancholy to add that this lady, once ruler of Rawcliffe and its wide domains, was reduced to sue the parish for relief. The overseers of Out Rawcliffe were ordered to give her £15 a year, and even this poor pittance they neglected to pay. No one can read the following report of the proceedings at the Quarter Sessions held at Preston on January 12, 1731, without commiserating the hard fate of this innocent victim of the mistaken loyalty of others.

On reading the order of the quarter sessions here holden the seventh day of October anno duodecimo Georgii R., that the overseers of the poor of Out Rawcliffe shall allowe and pay unto 'Ann Butler (widow of Henry Butler, deceased), a poore, impotent, aged, and decrepit person, the yearly sum of £15 by monthly payments for and towards her maintenance. This court doth order the p'sent overseers of the poor of Out Rawcliffe aforesaid forthwith to pay her all the arrears of the said (allowance); and the said Ann Butler appearing in court to be aged and more impotent and decrepit than heretofore, and a very great object of compassion, and her necessities very much increased, and she having occasion for the dayly attendance of a surgeon, this court doth order the overseers of the poor of Out Rawcliffe to allow and pay unto her, the said Ann Butler, at Preston, in the said county, being the nearest town to Out Rawcliffe where she can have the assistance of a surgeon, the yearly sum of £30 monthly by equal portions, and continue the monthly payment thereof till further order of this court, and as long as her necessities shall require. And if the said overseers refuse or neglect to perform the said order or any part thereof, then upon complaint made to any Justice of Peace of this county, a warrant shall be awarded against them to take their bonds to appear at the next sessions here to be holden to answer for their contempt.

We cannot give the date of this poor lady's death, but she could not have long survived this sad description of her state.

Rawcliffe Hall, about eight miles west of Garstang, stands on somewhat low ground which slopes to the River Wyre. The landscape is rendered pleasing by umbrageous woods, which are so disposed as to give the Hall the appearance of lying in the midst of a noble park. The soil is rich and fertile, and there are sufficient undulations of ground in the vicinity to relieve it from the flatness which is the general character of the district. The exterior of the house has no attractive features, a plain, rough-cast front having long since replaced the old quaint-timbered work of the Butlers, the only trace of which is to be found in an interior court. The house is full of old oak paneling, but this has been painted over, while the banqueting hall, a room of fine dimensions, contains the oldest reminiscences of the ancient proprietors. These are medallions of painted glass, on which are depicted the occupations or amusements of the different months. This was no uncommon species of ornamentation in mediæval times, and the peculiar dress carries us as far back as the reign of Richard the Second or his successor. In the Ordnance Survey Map is a spot marked as "Remains of R. C. Chapel," but in consequence of the re-building of that portion of the premises no remains are now visible. A stone holy-water stoup, however, still exists to represent for some uncertain period the faith of the ancient lords of Rawcliffe. A figure on the lawn of a harvesting girl, with a rake in one hand and an apple in the other, is vaguely said to be connected with the place by some tradition. Some say that it was placed there in remembrance of a girl remarkable for beauty, who was struck dead in the hay-field. Others think that it stands on the spot where formerly stood an image of St. Katharine, the patron Saint of the Butlers, and which, Baines says, it was usual to carry in procession at the time of harvest.

We are not aware that any ghostly traditions have gathered round this ancient house. It is affirmed that a young lady visitor came down to breakfast one morning, looking very white, and confessing to having had her rest disturbed by unearthly cries. Other sounds have been heard at the dead of night which have not been easily accounted for; but what old mansion is free from these supposed nocturnal visitations?

Rawcliffe Hall, and such portion of the former estate as the more recent proprietors have been able to purchase, has been in

possession of four different families since the days of the Butlers. It was left by the late owner, who died in 1859, to his reputed infant son, the present R. J. Barton Wilson France, Esq., who, though married, is without issue: should he die childless, it is bequeathed to Chelsea Hospital. Its fate reminds us of Pope's lines—

To heirs unknown, descends the unguarded store,
Or wanders, Heaven-directed, to the poor.

T. E. GIBSON.

The National Schools of Ireland and Christian Education.

THE recent publication by Mr. FitzPatrick of an essay on "Education and the State of Ireland," written by the celebrated J. K. L., and hitherto unprinted, has attracted much attention towards the question. In the essay, Bishop Doyle is dealing with the Education Commission for Ireland that was issued in 1825, with the Blue Book which that Commission produced, and with the antecedent and surrounding circumstances that affected the educational condition of Catholic children. It is, therefore, interesting to note the progress that has been made since that time, and instructive to observe how the designs of those whose efforts were directed towards using National Education as a means of proselytism, have been frustrated. The essay proves the uninterrupted opposition which was offered to the successive phases of the ever-renewed scheme by the hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland, and the difficulties (at one time deemed insuperable) which have been overcome. The importance of the subject cannot be overstated, for it is chiefly owing to the advance of education and learning that the condition of the people of Ireland at the present time is so materially different from what it was during the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth century.

The system of national schools in Ireland was first established, as is well known, in the year 1831. It was chiefly devised by Lord Anglesey, Mr. Plunket, Mr. Stanley (afterwards Lord Derby), and a few others, and was intended to give the people what had hitherto been denied them—a united secular education, with certain facilities for religious instruction. The whole system of education, like other branches of the Irish administration, had for a long period been grossly unjust to the Catholics. The Charter Schools, which were inaugurated by Primate Boulter, were distinctly and avowedly intended for purposes of proselytism, whilst the penal laws forbade Catholics

from engaging in the work of education. The Kildare Street Society, which received an endowment from Government, had the principal hand in National Education from the year 1812 to 1831. It was not actually a proselytizing society, but as its management fell almost exclusively into the hands of the Evangelical party, it gave general dissatisfaction, especially when a rule was adopted which made the reading of the Bible without note or comment compulsory in the schools. But, independently of this, the teachers were incompetent and the books were bad. Many of the former were so ignorant, that they were scarcely able to teach their pupils to read or write, whilst the majority scarcely ever thought it necessary to do more. There was a great want of practical and useful books, and it was admitted on all sides that until some alteration was made in this matter, there could be no hope of any improvement in the tone of education.

The general system of these National Schools was intended as a remedy, and Mr. Stanley based it upon the principle that the schools should be open to Christians of all denominations, and that though no pupil would be obliged to attend any religious teaching or course of instruction disapproved of by his parents, all necessary facilities would be afforded to pupils of the various religious beliefs to receive such religious instruction as their parents or guardians approved of. These latter clauses were inserted in order to protect the liberty of conscience and the rights of parents, two points that are set at naught by the modern school of Continental Liberals, and they guaranteed to a Catholic child attending a school where the majority was Protestant, a respect for his faith.

The measure was in fact at that period a great boon for Catholics, and as such was sanctioned by the prelates of the Church. The Protestant party, as long as they believed that the system could be made use of for furthering their own ends and maintaining the Established Church and the policy of ascendancy, supported it, but after a time seceded and set on foot a fresh system of education, exclusively Protestant, called the Church Education Schools. The Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, however, remained faithful to National Education, and his name and that of Dr. Murray, the Catholic Archbishop, appear amongst the first signatures on the official documents.

In order to protest against the accusation of indifference in matters of faith, which charge had been made against them from

the beginning (an accusation of which they bitterly complained in their first report), as well as to reassure the public, the members of the Commission of National Education in Ireland introduced into the regulations of the schools administered by them, the following clauses—

1. The ordinary school teaching, to which all children without distinction of religion are obliged to attend, and which is to last a specified number of hours, should embrace exclusively those subjects that relate to literature or morals. A volume of Biblical extracts is in course of preparation, under the direction of the Board, who recommend the use of it during school hours.

2. One day each week, exclusive of Sunday, is to be kept for religious instruction. This day the ministers of any religious denomination, or those who are specially designated by the parents or tutors of the children, are permitted to present themselves for the purpose of giving instruction.

3. The managers of the school must also, when the parents of many of the scholars express the wish, give every necessary facility for the same purpose, either before or after the ordinary hours for school on other days of the week.¹

Not satisfied with these regulations, clear and distinct as they were, the originators gave further vent to the expression of their sentiments by a hope that the clergy of the various denominations would participate in the arrangements and superintendence of the schools. They finished their remarks by the following clause—

It should be clearly understood that the clergy of all denominations, even when they have not signed a written request to the Board, are to have free access to the schools, not to take part in the ordinary teaching or to cause interruptions, but in their capacity as visitors and in order to take note how matters are conducted.

The National Board, or Commission of National Education, had, as has already been said, obtained the support of Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin. This prelate at the outset expressed his entire approval of the scheme, which he considered calculated to do much good in raising schools and teachers for thousands of the poor in places where Catholics were utterly unable to start any on their own responsibility. Down-trodden and persecuted as they had been for centuries, and unable to educate their children at any public institutions without great risk of the loss of their faith, a new era seemed

¹ *First Report*, p. 4.

to have dawned for them by the new system. Throughout the whole of Ireland, with but few exceptions, the bishops and clergy were determined to avail themselves to the utmost of what was offered them, and their approbation naturally contributed largely to render the new schools popular amongst the Catholics. The following circumstance also aided to render them popular: the Commissioners were allowed to grant money to found and support schools to those who made application and gave specified guarantees, afterwards to attend to the way these sums were expended. One clause specially stipulated that those persons who signed the application might themselves choose the managers of the school. In the vast majority of cases the Catholic clergy, after having been the first to sign the application, became the managers. In this way schools, which were actually National Schools under the patronage of the Government, became denominational. The feeling of the greater part of the Irish people, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Presbyterian, being in favour of the latter, it is not surprising that this was the practical result of the system of mixed education, and it affords another proof that legislation which is necessary and popular in England may be both unnecessary and unpopular in Ireland. In those instances where Protestant clergymen became managers, the schools under them became practically Protestant; and thus we sometimes find in the one parish two schools, both under the National Board, and both frequented exclusively by Protestants and Catholics. Previous to the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in 1869, the Protestant party, wherever it was possible, erected schools, which were supported by the Church Education Society, and which were both practically and theoretically denominational (the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible being an essential feature of the daily programme); but after that salutary measure of Mr. Gladstone's, the gentry began to find it inconvenient and expensive to support both churches and schools, and sought to place the latter under the National Board, the constitution of the school remaining as much as possible the same as before.

In the second report the members of the Board of National Instruction showed that out of 1,717 applications for funds to build schools, only 140 and 180 respectively had come from Protestant and Presbyterian ministers, whilst there were 1,397 from Catholic priests. In a Catholic country like Ireland this was not surprising, but was regarded at that time with some

astonishment, so accustomed had the ascendancy party been to delude themselves into the belief that the nation would eventually become Protestant. Amongst the laity who made application there were 6,915 Protestant names against 8,630 Catholics, the former being principally landlords. The hostility of the ministers of the Established Church was most remarkable and was commented upon with great severity by one of the Protestant English bishops in the House of Lords. "The facts which I have cited," he exclaimed, "will prove that if the clergy of one communion regard the new system with favour, those of the other are very much opposed to it. On the part of the Catholics we see approval; on that of the Protestants, distrust and hostility."

Undoubtedly in the beginning the system was more or less approved of by the Catholic bishops and clergy, but many things tended to make them dissatisfied. Two in particular gave great offence. One was an expression of Dr. Whately, the Protestant Archbishop, who had the imprudence towards the end of his life to admit to one of his intimate friends (Mr. Senior) that he had upheld the system of National Schools in Ireland because he believed it would prove one of the most efficacious, if not the most efficacious, means of undermining the faith of the people, but that of course he was unable to state this belief in a public or official manner.

It is quite evident that if a man like Dr. Whately, who had the reputation of being a large-minded and liberal man in comparison with the remainder of his Protestant fellow-countrymen, could hold such opinions, that nothing fair or just could be expected from those of a narrower and a more fanatical type of mind. The other cause of the discredit into which the National Schools fell was the death of Archbishop Murray, who had more or less espoused them, and the instalment of Cardinal Cullen in the vacant see, who was strongly opposed to all systems of mixed education. Educated in Rome, the capital of the Christian world, where he remained until the day that his late Holiness, Pope Pius the Ninth promoted him to the primatial see of Armagh, he arrived in Ireland imbued with Roman ideas on the matter of education, as of everything else, and completely a stranger to any kind of compromise. The whole system of the National Schools in Ireland being essentially a compromise, he opposed it, and the question was thereupon re-opened, and in the heat of the controversy it was made evident that it was

not the will but the power of the Protestant party, headed by Dr. Whately, that was wanting to prevent the system being made an instrument of proselytism. The Protestant clergy, who so lately had denounced the system, encouraged by the language of their Archbishop, began to imagine that something might be effected, and a species of reaction in favour of National Schools set in amongst them.

Mr. Lecky is of opinion that on the whole the system has conferred upon the rising generation of Irishmen the inestimable benefit of a sound secular education, and that it has contributed in some degree to allay the animosity of sects, whilst it would be difficult to cite a single instance of a Catholic who has become a Protestant, or a Protestant a Catholic under its influence. He writes of course as a Protestant, and expresses his opinion strongly, that the original system was tampered with for the benefit of Catholics, and that endowments have been freely given to sectarian convents managed by monks and nuns. The Annual Report of the Commissioners for the year 1876 shows that the number of schools was 7,334, and that there were 596,427 pupils, being an increase of 18,886 on the preceding year. The Annual Report of the Commission for the year 1878 shows the number of schools to be 7,443, an increase of nearly 100 over 1876, and states that during the year 69 schools, most of which had been inoperative for a considerable time, were struck off the roll or suspended, or became amalgamated with other national schools; that 142 schools were brought into operation, viz., 104 non-vested, 31 vested, and 7 suspended schools, giving a net increase of 73 schools, as compared with the year 1877. The number of pupils on the rolls on the last day of the month preceding the annual examinations of the Inspectors, and who actually attended school on any of the fourteen days immediately before that date, was 632,282. The number of individual pupils on the rolls who made any attendance between January 1 and December 31, 1878, was 1,036,742.

The total number of teachers trained in 1878 was 166, viz., 80 males and 86 females. Of these 58 were Catholics, 5 Protestant Episcopal, 45 Presbyterians, and 7 of other persuasions, showing a majority of 50 Protestants. Eighty-one of those trained were principal or assistant teachers, and 85 were chiefly ex-pupil teachers, ex-monitors, or distinguished pupils of National Schools. The total number trained from the commencement up to December 31, 1878, is 10,231.

The schools and pupils in 1876 were classified as 2,805, in which the masters were exclusively Catholic, with 370,204 Catholic pupils, and 26,688 Protestant pupils; 1,218 schools in which the masters were exclusively Protestant, with 26,382 Catholic pupils and 124,726 Protestant pupils, and 94 schools where the masters were conjointly Catholic and Protestant with 8,053 Catholic pupils, and 11,847 Protestant pupils.

In the year 1878 we find an increase of 33 schools in which the masters are exclusively Protestant, and an increase of 10 schools where the teachers are Catholic and Protestant conjointly, whilst as regards the pupils there is a decrease of Catholics, except in the schools of the latter. On the other hand, there is a considerable decrease of Protestant pupils in those schools where the masters are exclusively Catholic and a proportionate increase in both the others.

The following item is interesting as given by the Commissioners for 1878:

| | Mixed schools. | Cath. pupils. | Prot. pupils. |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Ulster | ... 56 ... | 32 per cent. | ... 68 per cent. |
| Munster | ... 15 ... | 51·6 | ... 48·4 |
| Leinster | ... 28 ... | 63·5 | ... 36·5 |
| Connaught | ... 5 ... | 42·8 | ... 57·2 |

SUMMARY.

| No. of schools. | Catholic pupils. | Protestant pupils. | Per centage of each denomination to total mixed attendance. | |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|---|--------------|
| | | | Catholics. | Protestants. |
| 4,160 | 401,382 | 161,946 | 71·3 | 28·7 |

According to the Report of the Commissioners for the past year, 1879, we find an increase of nearly 80 schools on the operation list, whilst the average daily attendance of pupils does not appear to have been so good. This is accounted for by the exceptional severity of the weather in the early part of the year, by the continuous rain during the spring and summer, and by the great distress which was experienced throughout the western districts of the country.

The total number of teachers and students trained is encouraging for Catholics. The figures stand at 70 as against 58 in the year previous. The Commissioners in this Report, as well as in those before, express their regret at the apathy exhibited by the managers of National Schools, in not availing

themselves of the facilities afforded by Act of Parliament for providing suitable dwellings for teachers in places where none exist. The National School Teachers' Act, which was passed in August, 1879, places a sum of £1,300,000, provided out of the Church surplus, at the disposal of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with the consent of the Treasury, for grants of pensions or gratuities to classed teachers of National Schools, on retirement from the service, to take effect from the commencement of the present year. The Commissioners express their opinion that the best results may be expected from the measure, and there can be no doubt that it ought to prove most beneficial.

Previous to the disestablishment of the Protestant Church, as we have already stated, many schools which are now classified as National were then under the control of the Church Education Society, but in any case it is no exaggeration to say that the schools in Ireland, though nominally National and subject to the rules of the National Board, which approves of the principle of mixed education, are practically denominational and under the control of the parish clergy. In one instance, where the school was in the hands of the Christian Brothers, the parish priest made an application that the school should be placed under the National Board, in order that he might be enabled to exercise a greater amount of authority over it than he could do under the *régime* of the Christian Brothers, a proceeding which no parish priest would have taken did he not strongly believe in the denominational working of the present system and its general efficiency.

Until the year 1879 the Government had not taken any steps with regard to intermediate education in Ireland, which naturally had a bad effect upon the country in general. According to an official report published in the year 1871, there were only 10,814 children in Ireland, out of a population of six and a half millions of people, receiving intermediate education, *i.e.*, 2 out of a 1,000; whilst in England the proportion was 10 or 15 to the 1,000. The number of young men who in Ireland take up the ecclesiastical career is large, and therefore the grievance was great. In the year 1861 there were only 729 schools where Latin and Greek, modern languages, and mathematics were taught. The recent measures of the late Government on this matter promise the best results, and have given a general impetus to education throughout the country. Every year examinations take place in the different parts of Ireland,

which are conducted on the same plan as those local examinations which were instituted in England by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and prizes and posts of distinction awarded to the most successful. These privileges are open to pupils and to schools of all religious persuasions, which of itself is an immense step in the direction of justice to Irish Catholics, who will no doubt, once they have attained complete equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen in the means of acquiring knowledge, speedily eclipse them, and prove to the world that hitherto the difficulties thrown in their way had alone hindered them from achieving fame. The object of the measure was to stimulate the zeal of teachers as well as pupils, and arrangements were for that purpose made to compensate the former by rewards in proportion to the number of successful pupils they had sent up for examination. Though long delayed, it was welcomed by all parties as wise and just, and with but few exceptions was acquiesced in by men of all religious opinions. Amendments were made by Mr. Newdegate and others, who imagine they detect some Jesuit conspiracy working behind every measure proposed that will directly or indirectly benefit Catholicism, to the effect that schools under the management of Catholic priests should be excluded; but they were not well received, and the general consensus of opinion was in favour of it. A million sterling was voted out of the Irish Church surplus fund, which thus, in a measure and to a certain extent, reverts to its original purpose, viz., the furtherance and development of Catholic interests, after having been used for three hundred years to foster a system intended to extirpate Catholicism.

The intermediate Education Board for Ireland has recently issued its first report. Nothing, we are informed by the Commissioners, could be more satisfactory than the harmony which prevailed and the good feeling with which the head masters of the schools of different religions co-operated in the arrangement of local details. There were altogether 3,954 candidates, boys and girls. Of these about twenty per cent. must be deducted before the failures and successes are numbered up, about that proportion having been entirely unprepared, and manifestly having only entered to see what the examination was like. The results are gratifying and encouraging, for out of these 3,954 candidates, 3,332 passed in two or more divisions, whilst 109 boys and 22 girls obtained exhibitions of substantial

value. Over £4,500 was paid in rewards, and over £7,462 as results' fees, these sums being shared alike by Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists.

All is not, however, smooth sailing, and the difficulty of legislation in Ireland is strongly evidenced by the fact that even in a measure like this, calculated and intended to be carried out impartially, dissatisfaction has already shown itself in some quarters. According to the Dublin correspondent of the *Times*,² great annoyance has been shown by Protestants at the selection of convent schools wherein to hold the second annual examination under the Intermediate Education Act, so far as girls were concerned. Several parents refused to send their children to the examinations, although they had paid the necessary fees, and they protested against the arrangements as a violation of the unsectarian principle of the Act. We do not know for certain the facts of the different cases, but it may fairly be presumed that the authorities, who are certainly not partial to convents, merely selected convent schools in certain localities because they were the best places to hold a large number of persons for examination, and the objection of Protestants against entering convent schools for such a purpose must be regarded in the light of a bigoted and factious objection. It is this spirit of narrow-minded exclusiveness which is so fatal to the well-being of Ireland, and lowers its people in the opinion of outsiders. To be consistent, those who advocate it should leave the country, for as long as full civil and religious liberty exists, they must inevitably encounter in a Catholic country many things which to them seem idolatrous and wicked. They may be considered, however (happily for the good of Ireland), as a steadily decreasing minority, and it is somewhat reassuring to know that the general spirit of the masses throughout the United Kingdom is entirely opposed to them. Many persons, who have no sympathy whatever with Catholicism, are inclined to attribute much of the misery and discontent that exists in Ireland as the result of the past legislation, which sought to engraft the reformed religion on the soil.

It is curious to note the change of public opinion on this matter. Not many years ago the idea of applying the funds of the official Church in Ireland to such purposes would have been deemed sacrilegious, but now it is generally acquiesced in by many of those who would formerly have opposed it, while it

² The *Times*, June, 1880.

is hailed with delight by their original opponents. The whole manner in which the measure was planned and carried out gave general satisfaction in Ireland, and was regarded as the harbinger of better things, and the commencement of a new era in Irish education. It gave a great impetus to those who were anxious to settle the question of a Catholic University; and though the O'Connor Don's Bill on the subject was not encouraged, a Conservative administration, in the person of their Lord Chancellor, brought forward and carried a Bill which practically gave the death-blow to the Queen's Universities, and established a new Royal University, the senate of which is composed half of Catholics and half of Protestants. The Catholic and Protestant Archbishops of Dublin are both upon it, and though little has yet been accomplished, the general opinion seems to be that it will prove a great blessing to Catholics in Ireland, and may eventually become by further legislation thoroughly satisfactory in all respects.³

There are many difficulties in connection with the primary schools under the National Board which might well be remedied. The crucifix and statues of a religious description are, for instance, altogether excluded.

English history is taught after a peculiar fashion. Certain portions are carefully excluded by express official direction, such as those that treat of the evil deeds and the sanguinary tyranny of Henry the Eighth. This fact has been more than once publicly stated by Lord Denbigh. A few years ago, on paying a visit to a National School (the name of which his lordship mentioned at the time) under the care of a religious community, he was requested by the Reverend Mother Superior to examine a class on any subject he liked. He chose English history, and asked some question concerning the reign of Henry the Eighth. But the good nun whispered in his ear, "That part Government forbids to be taught."

The results of recent education legislation are on the whole satisfactory, and as there is every prospect of further development in a matter of such importance, we may trust that every successive Government will realize the fact that denominational education is alone practicable. H. BELLINGHAM.

³ Since the above was written, the Bishops of Ireland have drawn up a pastoral to the effect that recent legislation has not satisfied the reasonable claims of Catholics, or removed their long-existing causes of discontent; that the godless universities, so frequently condemned by the Holy See, are still endowed, and that efforts must still be made to bring about a more satisfactory solution of the question.

*An Archbishop of Paris.*¹

PART THE FIRST.

THROUGH a momentous period of more than thirty years, in the course of which the Society of Jesus was suppressed and the preparation for the French Revolution was being hurried forward, Christophe de Beaumont as the Archbishop of Paris stood forth in the eyes of Europe a conspicuous champion of Catholicity, loved by the poor, hated by the Jansenists, persecuted by the Parliament, admired by Frederick of Prussia, pursuing the plain path of his episcopal duty, incorruptible, and absolutely fearless. He has been compared not without reason with St. Athanasius. In several characteristic features the Jansenism of a hundred years ago in France resembled the Arianism of the fourth century. It had passed from the schools of theology into the arena of civil strife, and its theses were sustained not for their logical or patristic value but as the watchword of a party in the State. The ostentation of zeal for the purity of faith and for the sanctity of sacraments only thinly disguised very simple motives of earthly ambition and coarse selfishness. Whoever came across the path of Arians or of Jansenists did so at his peril. Arianism was more out-spoken. The later heresy was dishonest to the core. It lived by concealment. It was in point of doctrine only and simply Calvinism disguised under many specious phrases and called by another name, and if it could have been made known at the first to Catholic France for what it really was, it would have enjoyed no greater influence within the Church than genuine Calvinism—the most injurious without exception of all the blasphemies which man has ever uttered to the dishonour of the Christian God. To assert that the Almighty created some of His creatures in order to exult in their destruction, and that the

¹ *Etudes religieuses, philosophiques, historiques et littéraires, par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jesus.* Sept. 1875, Janv. 1876, et seq. *Christophe de Beaumont*, par P. Regnault.

Second Person of the Blessed Trinity restricted Redemption to the favoured few, is to deny in the face of God His favourite attribute of mercy and to represent the "sweet Saviour of perishing mankind" as cruel and capricious. Jansenism needed darkness, and therefore there was little danger of a repetition of such clumsy calumnies as those which were directed against Athanasius, but more insidious accusations had to be carefully prepared to undermine the influence of Christophe de Beaumont. A great display of zeal for truth was found to be compatible with utter disregard of truthfulness. Never were theory and practice more visibly at variance. Never since the lifetime of the original Pharisees against whom our Lord hurled His chapter of woes have any human beings understood as well as the French Jansenists how to strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. The heresy, which was distinguished in books by the teaching of the most rigorous morality, exhibited itself in the commentary which the conduct of its professors provided as a rule of life of all rules the easiest and the most condescending to human weakness, untrammelled by any petty considerations of right and wrong, and altogether regardless of inconvenient scruples.

The special attraction and perilousness of Jansenism in its first appearance was that it provided a formula for certain vague supernatural terrors which too readily find a dwelling in the hearts of men conscious of having sinned mortally, and not equally sure of their restoration to grace. Conscience makes cowards, and fallen nature shrinks from the searching eye of God, and only learns by degrees and with an effort to trust His fatherly love. It is the work of the Catholic Church, with its sacraments, to bring men back not only to their lost inheritance, but also to the knowledge of their privilege, and to the full sense of "the liberty of the children of God," to teach them that their Creator is an angry Judge only to those who till their dying day have refused to know Him as their Father. Moreover, the gloomiest views of religion which can be made to fall within the limits of uncondemned doctrine have a peculiar fascination for some pious persons, and that which is in reality an evidence of wilfulness—a proof of that secret pride from which all of us do well to pray to be delivered—easily takes the colouring of humility. Nothing is more remarkable in the history of this miserable fanaticism than the grievousness of the damage which it was able to inflict upon communities of

nuns. The history of the two Mothers Angélique of Port Royal is sadly useful in its lesson of warning and its dismal picture of the infatuation which is the judicial chastisement of proud disobedience. The elder of the name had been under the direction of St. Francis of Sales, and it was not her fault, but her misfortune, that she was transferred from his good guidance. "It is impossible," says Father Dalgairns,² "not to feel a sort of melancholy when we read the pathetic letters addressed by the Mère Angélique to her director, St. Francis of Sales, consulting him about resigning even her poor abbey, from a wish to cease to be Superioress, and entreating him to take upon him the entire guidance of her soul. The answers of the Saint show at once his affection for her, and his full appreciation of her earnestness and energy, as well as of her restless and domineering spirit. Of all women in France, the Abbess of Port Royal required a director." It seems that she had some desire to join the Order of the Visitation, but St. Francis did not encourage the thought, and when he died she fell into the hands of Saint-Cyran, the practised poisoner of pious minds, and, aided by him, she lived to work more harm in Christendom than the tears of saints and the blood of many martyrs in the French Revolution could efface. In its last stage, which belongs to my present subject, Jansenism had degenerated into mere vulgar obstinacy. Its adherents were identified with a system of revolt and defiance; they had nailed their colours to the mast, and resolved that, come what might of anathema from Bishop or Pope, submission should not be yielded by them. The second Mère Angélique, niece of the first, and her successor as Abbess of Port Royal, showed this spirit in its typical development. When the more refractory of the nuns were removed by force from their convent, the scene of so much guilty pride, the Abbess, being asked her name in the process of examination, proclaimed it boastfully, and afterwards remarked that "it was like confessing to the Name of God, to confess to the name of Arnauld." She died impenitent. "It never seems to have struck her," says Father Dalgairns,³ "that the cause of God might not be identical with that of her family, nor that the Catholic Church, of which she stoutly professed herself a member, was more likely to be right than a convent of women."

Christophe de Beaumont from the outset of his public career planted himself full and fair in the path of the Jansenists,

² *The Devotion to the Heart of Jesus. Introduction, p. 14.* ³ *Ibid. p. 35.*

resolved with the grace of God to beat back their aggression or perish in the effort. He partly effected his purpose, for he unmasked their false piety; but he could not save unrepenting France from their violence. The simple fact, patent to those who read history in the light of faith is that France had well earned her chastisement and was going to receive it. To purify the land polluted by hideous impieties in every rank of life from the miserable dotard on the throne to the vulgar imitators of fashionable vice, a flood of Noe was demanded—a deluge of blood. If the people had cried for mercy like the citizens of Nineveh they might have found it; but nothing was farther from the thoughts of the nation, when Christophe de Beaumont fell asleep in Christ, than any public expression of remorse. To sit down in sackcloth and ashes was not according to the selfish temper of that generation. If the deluge was coming, as it surely was, the opportunities of pleasure would last till those who had brought about the catastrophe had passed from the scene. It was not only the King who said this,⁴ but it was the multitude of the leaders of the people who thought it, and acted upon it.

It is easy to offend God, but not easy to escape without repentance from His heavy hand of vengeance. Warnings given and not taken can scarcely be considered as part-payment of the debt of expiation, and therefore when we see a very guilty nation after many warnings only hardening itself in its revolt against the Almighty, we may well fear that the end of its exemplary punishment has not come yet. We may go back one hundred years to learn a lesson which comes almost as freshly now as when it was first delivered.

Christophe de Beaumont, who at great cost to himself fought that same battle of faith and virtue which has now to be recommenced after a full century of experimental knowledge of the dire consequences of irreligious philosophy, was born in 1703, of a family illustrious in the history of France. He was the youngest of three sons, and, as is so often the case with the saints and servants of God, was formed to virtue from his infancy by a mother who knew that it is a part of maternal love to teach children to deny themselves. O that Christian

⁴ "Vous ne savez pas," said Louis the Fifteenth to M. Gontaut in the presence of Madame de Pompadour, with Madame du Hausset listening at the door, "ce qu'ils font et ce qu'ils pensent : c'est une assemblée de républicains. En voilà, au reste, assez : les choses comme elles sont dureront autant que moi" (*Études Religieuses, &c.*, Fevrier, 1877, No. 2, p. 243).

mothers in these yet more perilous days would "see and understand" that it is very cruel to be too indulgent! Christophe de Beaumont was a boy of high spirit, impulsive and impetuous, and he must have needed all the firm pressure of that gentle hand to keep him in due subjection and good order, but the careful training had its immediate and blessed reward in innocence preserved. In his boyhood, as in his militant episcopal career, he imitated St. Athanasius, and, like him, he was "of angelic face and more angelic mind."⁵ With all his French vivacity, even as a child he had a deep sense of duty and much earnestness, so that he was remarkable for his industry. All through his long life he loved the early morning hours. This was one of the valued lessons learned at his good mother's knee. Another of her lessons was to show pity to the poor. Of his self-sacrificing charity there will be occasion to speak again. Christophe was too young when his father died, in 1710, to have felt his influence much, but in the dying wish of the Comte de la Roque, who requested that there might be at his funeral "no pomp, but a great deal of praying," we may find an indication that the influence, as far as it extended, was good and Catholic.

Very little information remains of the college course of Christophe, but in due time he was sent to Toulouse, and there, in Holy Week of 1723, he received the tonsure. He had been recognized from the first as the priest of the family, so that while he was still a child his elder brothers used to call him, Monseigneur; but it would be unjust to accuse his parents of trying, in the bad fashion of those days, to force him into a vocation from motives of temporal advantage. Of his father we do not know enough, and of his mother we know too much, to cast so grave an imputation upon their memory. It was too often found convenient to consign the younger sons of noble families to an ecclesiastical career, but that does not give us the right to infer that every younger son of a noble family who entered the service of the Church was so selected. God could give and has given true vocations to noble and simple in every time and place, for He does what He likes with His own; and Christophe de Beaumont, fitted by nature and grace for the sacerdotal life, needed no other inducement to embrace it than the whispered invitation of the Holy Ghost. It is the more

⁵ Ἀγγελικὸς τὸ εἶδος, ἀγγελικώτερος τὴν διάνοιαν (St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. in laudem Athanasii* XXI.).

necessary to remember that in the present instance there is absolutely no proof of undue pressure having been brought to bear, because we find our young ecclesiastic already advanced to high preferment before he had arrived at the diaconate. It gives a curious little insight into the ways and manners of a generation separated from our own by so short an interval of years, and yet already fossilized, to know that the vacancies in the Chapter of Lyons were competed for by aristocratic claimants, a necessary condition of candidacy being the formal authentication of nobility for four generations on both the father's and the mother's side. Christophe was pursuing his studies in Paris when in 1731 a courier arrived in haste, bearing the important news that, in consequence of the demise of the noble and reverend René de Lévy, a place was vacant in the Chapter of Lyons. Christophe's name had been long inscribed on the list of aspirants, but there was no time to lose, for the interests of an absent candidate did not always receive on such occasions the attention which they deserved. He did not tarry, but when he arrived at Lyons he found himself already elected.⁶

Shortly before this candidature for the canonry of Lyons, while the future Archbishop was completing his studies at Toulouse, a sad event occurred in that city, which deserves to be remembered for its own sake, and which, in the fresh recollection of the recent inundations, will be only too readily realized. The Garonne rose suddenly in the middle of September, 1727, and flooded all the lower part of the town. Among the fugitives were monks and nuns of various orders and congregations, but *not* the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, and this was the reason. The very day when the river rose, good Père Badou, of the Society of Christian Doctrine, came to give a retreat to the nuns. He had not suspected the gravity of the danger and the Sisters in their deep recollection did not notice the spreading deluge or the wide commotion. Every moment the peril grew greater. The river was sapping the walls and dashing against the gates of the convent. All too late Père Badou knew his grievous imprudence. The agony

⁶ "Laquelle réquisition mise en délibération, lesdits Seigneurs capitulans, après avoir fait faire lecture dudit acte de baptistaire du dix aoust mil sept cent trois . . . ont donné et conféré audit noble Christophle de Beaumont ladite chanoinie et Comté de Lyon, vacante par le décès dudit Me. de Levy, aux honneurs, droits et revenus en dépendants, à la charge néanmoins de faire ses preuves de noblesse de quatre générations paternelles et maternelles, à la forme des statuts et reglemens de cette Eglise d'observer iceux . . ." (*Etudes, Septembre, 1875, p. 342*).

of death lasted fourteen hours. The community retreated to the oldest and most enduring part of the convent, but wall after wall fell in, and the Sisters were crushed under the ruins or drowned in the rush of the stream. Not one escaped of fifty-two.

Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, died in 1729, at the age of seventy-eight. Latterly, his failing strength had not permitted him to meet the Jansenists with the energy which their insolence demanded. For fourteen years the Bull *Unigenitus* had been resisted by the Gallican clergy of Paris. The new Archbishop, Mgr. de Vintimille de Luc signalized his entrance into office by an act of vigour. At his instigation the Metropolitan Chapter published their solemn acceptance of the Bull. The Doctors of the Sorbonne followed, much helped thereunto by a broad hint of the King that they would act wisely in doing so. This was the letter of Louis the Fifteenth to the Faculty of Theology.

Dear and well-beloved,—The hope which We had formed that those of your number who had declared their opposition to the Constitution *Unigenitus*, would at length return to their duty and make sincere submission to this Bull, which We have on several occasions proclaimed to be a law of the Church and of the State, has hitherto caused us to delay the punishment which according to the rigour of Our decrees is due to them. But instead of being induced by Our clemency to change their conduct, we have been informed that several of these doctors have renewed their temerarious appeal from this Constitution against the express prohibition contained in Our declaration of the 4th of August, 1720; that the greater part of them have signified their adherence to the Bishop of Senez, that some have written to him to uphold his doctrine, and that they have gone so far as to revoke the signature which they had appended to the formulary in order to gain admission into your Faculty, a proceeding which, according to the terms of your resolutions, shuts them out in perpetuity from the degrees of the Faculty and the privileges thereto attached. Therefore, unable any longer to disregard so insolent and wicked a revolt, We address to you this letter to signify Our will that all those who subsequently to Our declaration of the 4th of August, 1720, have appealed from the Constitution *Unigenitus*, or who have adhered in any manner whatsoever to the Bishop of Senez, as also those who have retracted their signature of the formulary, are deprived of all doctoral functions and claims, and excluded from your assemblies—hereby forbidding them to assist thereat and you to admit them, under pain, in this whole matter, of disobedience. We order your syndic to notify to them Our orders hereupon and to put in force These Presents, which shall be read to them at your

next assembly and inscribed on your registers. This without fail; for such is Our good pleasure. Given at Versailles, the 22nd of October, 1729. (Signed) LOUIS.

Three weeks after the publication of this letter, ninety-five out of the one hundred and one Doctors, deputed by the Faculty to discuss the situation and prescribe the line of conduct which ought to be pursued, agreed that the Papal Constitution in question was to be accepted as a dogmatic judgment of the universal Church. The appeal to a general council and all the other acts of disobedience to the Sovereign Pontiff were at the same time solemnly revoked, and it was ordered that all candidates for theological degrees from that time forward, under pain of exclusion, should swear that they adhered "with heart and mind" to the Bull *Unigenitus*. Christophe de Beaumont was among the first who were called upon to take the oath. The Jansenists were by no means subdued. The apparent calm was but for the moment, and fresh storms were gathering below the horizon.

To the period of Christophe's last studies in Paris belongs a delightful anecdote of his compassion for the poor and afflicted. He was on his way to the capital in the depth of winter. At the roadside inn where they rested for the night, a poor courier opened the door, and with chattering teeth and trembling limbs, staggered rather than walked to the corner by the fire. He was flushed with fever. The young Count-Canon of Lyons squeezed his story out of him. The poor man was in despair. If he did not get to his destination quickly he would risk the loss of his employment, upon which he relied for the support of his wife and children, and yet it was not possible for him in his exhausted state to bear the terrible jolting of the cart without springs which had shaken him into a fever already, and would kill him outright if he continued his journey. Christophe was in vigorous health and did not fear a little rough riding, so without a thought of his dignity, he put the disconsolate courier into his own comfortable post-chaise, and followed as best he might in the ruder conveyance. We may pause to admire the prudence which kept pace with his charity. He had no mind to expose himself to the unnecessary danger of close confinement with a fever-patient, even in the performance of an act of the highest generosity. Afterwards, when he was Archbishop of Paris, he never could keep long possession of a watch. A gold watch was a convenient alms, ready to

hand and containing much value in small compass, and five times in one year he answered some piteous tale by parting with his watch. A lady at last cured him of the bad habit by making him a present of a watch on condition of his retaining it with fidelity.

Although the date of this undignified entry into Paris is not given, it seems likely that it was the prelude to a serious illness which threatened to cut short the studies of our young canon in the early days of February, 1733. It is amusing to find the occurrence of a fog in Paris chronicled as an historic event. "All the world was walking in the streets with torches, candles, and tapers—nay, it was a matter of difficulty to find one's way or one's own door. These fogs settled down upon Paris, and were brought to us by malignant winds from Germany." The canonry of Lyons imposed serious obligation of residence, and Christophe could only procure permission to continue his course of theology in Paris upon condition of reporting himself every three months.

The young canon-elect of Lyons was ordained subdeacon in 1731, deacon in 1733, priest in 1734. He had scarcely been raised to the priesthood, when he was invited to attend the grand Jubilee at Lyons, which began three days after his ordination and lasted another three days. He gave his promise to be there. This high festival of the Lyonnese deserves a brief description, for in all its circumstances it is characteristic of the time and the place. Curiously the celebration of the Jubilee in that year depended upon an act of submission to the authority of the Pope on a point of discipline. An error had crept into the French calendar, in which Easter Sunday was marked for the 16th of April, whereas the right date was the 25th of April. The Jubilee which was a special privilege of the Church of Lyons, had been granted for the year in which the feast of Corpus Christi should coincide with the feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist. This had already occurred three times in 1451, 1546, and 1666. It will occur again in 1886. Two other cases of concurrent feasts were in the same way kept holy by the people of Lyons: the coincidence of Good Friday and St. George's Day, and of Easter Sunday and St. Mark's Day.⁷ The dispute about the

⁷ Quand Georges Dieu crucifera,
Quand Marc le ressuscitera,
Et lorsque Jean le portera,
Grand jubilé dans Lyon sera.

date of Easter was settled by reference to Rome. The submission to the Papal decision would have been less joyous, if instead of conferring upon the good citizens the grace of a centenary festival it had deprived them of that satisfaction. The triduum of the Jubilee came at the end of a month of earnest spiritual preparation. The Fathers of the Society of Jesus preached a mission in six of the principal churches, and the Jansenist journals lamented the prodigious concourse. A mandate issued by the deputy-governor of Lyons shows that police regulations were somewhat stringent in those days: "However much confidence we are bound to repose in the prudence and good behaviour of the inhabitants of this city, after the proof which they have given thereof in the religious zeal displayed throughout the exercises of the mission, We have deemed it Our duty to adopt certain measures of precaution in order to secure the public peace, which might be disturbed by too large a gathering during the time of the Jubilee. . . . To avoid disorder and confusion, We forbid any person to visit the Church of St. John more than once between Wednesday and Saturday, as also to enter the primatial church by the gate leading from the Archbishop's Palace, or by the Gate of the Holy Cross, *under pain of eight days' imprisonment*, as these two gates are reserved for egress." The arrangements were so successful that no one was crushed to death or wounded, either in the rush of pilgrims to the church or in the great spectacle which closed the day of St. John with triumphal trophies and fireworks never surpassed before. The Jubilee was terminated by a public act of reparation in which about forty thousand people responded to the appeal of Father Perusseau, holding up their hands and imploring as with one voice the mercy of God. Certainly the pestilence of fourteen years before had not passed over the city without doing good.

The edifying deportment of Christophe de Beaumont in the sacred ministry finds its most marked eulogium in what was intended for an insult. "He is a piece of marble, cold, hard, and smooth." Cold and hard he certainly was not; and the fact that these words should have ever passed for a description of one so sensitive to generous impulses and so warm-hearted, shows better than many flattering speeches that he was severely watchful over himself. His cousin and great friend from early days, François de Crussol, was consecrated Bishop of Blois in 1735. The diocese needed a firm hand,

for the Jansenists were there in strength, having spread the infection of their fraudulent heresy in several parishes and convents, partly by the aid of pretended miracles which they manufactured as occasion required. The first care of the young Bishop was to surround himself with trusty and energetic labourers, and he called Christophe de Beaumont to his aid, making him one of his Vicars-General. In the three years of his vicariate Christophe de Beaumont earned for himself the honour of being hated by the seducers of the people, the wolves in sheep's clothing, the men who preached austere sanctity and practised calumny and deliberate profanity. One sample of their spirit may suffice. To find a passage from the pen of a *soi-disant* Catholic more redolent than this of disobedience to the living Church of Christ, it might be necessary to turn to the columns of some Ritualistic newspaper. The Jansenist organ, *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, treats its readers to the following remarks upon occasion of the canonization of the glorious St. Vincent de Paul.

This Saint of new creation has had the misfortune to be canonized by dint of false testimony alone, and his praises are never sounded at the holy altar except in concert with outrageous declamation against all that is most enlightened and most worthy of reverence in the whole experience of the Church in France. But by a singular Providence, the voice of the people, which in these matters, even more than in any other, has always been regarded as the voice of God, is not in agreement with the voice of the declaimers: the faithful do not yield their assent, and as a consequence remain inactive. The pulpits may resound with the name and the virtues of the new Saint: his opposition to an imaginary heresy and his alleged separation from the friends of Port Royal may be loudly extolled, his festival may be celebrated with every sign of pride and ostentation, . . . but in spite of all these endeavours, this splendour and external pomp, the people remain in their coldness and do not feel that confidence which can come from God alone. They read the placards and they keep in their houses. All the powers of this world, all the credit and industry of men, seem to conspire to establish this devotion, and it falls unheeded. These same powers make every effort to destroy the devotion to the holy Deacon,⁷ and it goes triumphantly forward. This happens because the feeble voice of man appeals unaided to the sterile tomb of the canonized Saint, whereas men are drawn irresistibly to the tomb of the blessed Deacon by incessant manifestations of the power of the right hand of the Most High—a surer sanction than all canonizations to justify the *cultus* of a servant of God after his death.

⁷ This is a reference to the sickening fooleries enacted at the tomb of the Jansenist deacon Pâris in the cemetery of St. Médard. He died in 1727.

The Parliament of Paris had already gone considerably beyond mere verbal impudence in dealing with the case of St. Vincent de Paul, for a year before the publication of the malicious trash, which I have quoted for a specimen, that high court of justice⁸ calmly and coolly suppressed on its own authority the Bull of Canonization. The lawyers of Paris seem to have supposed that they had received a Divine commission to instruct the *Ecclesia Docens*, and that they knew more than she did about the blessed inhabitants of Heaven. The whole situation was anomalous to the last degree, and it must be confessed that Frenchmen have not always shown that devotion to good logic and that self-consistency which in their own esteem distinguish them so honourably from John Bull, whose heart is ever better than his head. It is considered a part of our national character that we can accept principles and recoil from conclusions, while the French intellect is forced by sheer logical necessity to ride a theory to death and a political maxim to the bitter end. Yet these men of legal acumen, members of the Parliament of Paris in the middle of last century, were so blinded by party hatred that they never arrived at the first conception of the ridiculousness of their own attitude before the bar of history. They did not, like their great-great-grandchildren, persecute the church because they believed Christianity to be a failure, but they loudly professed their belief in the Divine origin of the Catholic Church, and in her sacraments and priesthood, insomuch that, upon their own showing, nothing but solicitude for the purity of discipline and the sanctity of ritual urged them to interpose the weight of their authority in spiritual concerns. It is easy to see now that, thinking as they said they did and acting as they did, they must have been either dishonest in their words or unreasonable in their conduct, that is to say, either knaves or fools, according as they did or did not apprehend the incompatibility of their avowed sentiments with their notorious behaviour. They themselves, we may be sure, were delightfully unconscious of having placed themselves in any such discreditable dilemma. If they were fools, which is the less probable alternative, we need not trouble ourselves with any laborious investigation of their motives. If they were knaves, acting as the miserable Saint-Cyran used to exhort his deluded disciples to do, "secretly, for fear of the Jews," nothing certainly could have been farther from their intentions than to

⁸ The old French Parliaments were not representative assemblies.

manifest to the world the hidden crookedness of their ways ; but in that hypothesis, while they were diligently screening from the eyes of men that guilty conspiracy "against the Lord and against His Christ" which formed the only intelligible nexus between their words and deeds, they were at the same time, against their desire, presenting themselves to dispassionate observers as men who were capable of making laws and fighting battles without any perceptible motive. They could have furnished a very clear statement of their reasons, but they did not choose to do so ; and they had a large penalty to pay, for they could not escape from the imputation of treachery except by incurring the reproach of mental incoherence. It is well that we should observe the tactics and demeanour of this Gallican Parliament, for it was mainly instrumental in bringing to maturity the "Principles of '89," and the archiepiscopate of Christophe de Beaumont was one perpetual struggle against its impertinent intermeddling in spiritual relations. It is hard to believe that these lawyers were sincere in their loud protestations of zeal for religion. *Credat Judæus Apelles, non ego.*

While the young vicar-general of the diocese of Blois was earning for himself the detestation of many contumacious priests and fanatical nuns, he took captive the hearts of the poor. Heresy has a spirit as well as a doctrine of its own, and one of the most universally present symptoms of error in faith, whether systems or separate men are under examination of orthodoxy, is to find every impulse and instinct ranging itself on the wrong side. This was pre-eminently the case with Jansenism. When the plague was raging in Lyons in 1720 the noble-hearted Bishop Henri de Belzunce rose to the greatness of the occasion, and worked for his flock with an heroic zeal which has made his name immortal in the annals of Christian charity, and therefore it is scarcely necessary to say, for it follows "by order of good consequence," that he had been for years before the *bête noir* of the Jansenists in that part of France. It is a matter of history that the Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was opposed with the most bitter animosity by these Crypto-Calvinists, who first declared it to be rank heresy, then ridiculed it as sentimental piety, and spared no efforts to prevent its development. It is not surprising that the devoted administrator who endeared himself to the poor of Blois in the famine year of 1737, was marked out for the lasting revenge of the revilers of the Sacred Heart.

Fortunately, for into better hands it could not have fallen, just at this time when money was wanted to keep the people from starving, the young vicar-general received a welcome addition to his income, being named Commendatary Abbot of an abbey which no longer existed except as a source of revenue—the Abbey of Notre Dame in the little town of Vertus. It had been founded at the close of the eleventh century, and having been repeatedly sacked in the English wars, was left in ruins by the Earl of Salisbury in 1420. Having been rebuilt, it was burned down by the Huguenots and never rose again.

Free-masonry was just beginning to be the fashion in France, imported, under the Regency, from England as the form of the name in use at first implied. "Our noblemen at Court," said Barbier, "have quite recently invented an order having the name of *Frimassons*, after the example of England, where they have in this way various orders of private persons. . . . As such secret assemblies are very dangerous in a state, Cardinal de Fleury has considered it right to stifle this order of knight-hood in its birth, and he has forbidden all these gentlemen to meet together and to hold chapters of this kind." Clement the Twelfth in 1738 condemned the association, but it continued to expand, finding support from the Parliament of Paris for the very reason that it was under ban at Rome, and it soon counted in its ranks a prince of the blood, the Count de Clermont. Louis the Fifteenth had the wish, but not the effective will, to restrain the usurpations of the Parliament in things purely spiritual. He could write a really royal letter, as on occasion of the centenary of the consecration of France by Louis the Eleventh to our Blessed Lady, but already the disorders of his private life were destroying all his power for good. His young Queen was left in cold neglect at Versailles, even at the time which immediately followed the birth of the princess whom we know as Madame Louise, one of the redeeming glories of the house of Bourbon.

Christophe de Beaumont was too illustrious by birth and virtue to have any reasonable hope of escaping a mitre, and his name was mentioned frequently to Cardinal Fleury. The ambition which had betrayed itself in his earnest application for the canonry of Lyons when he was only a tonsured clerk had been smothered in his breast by the holier thoughts which came with the sacerdotal unction, and as long as he could he found excuses for not satisfying the Cardinal's desire to become

personally acquainted with him, but in the course of a visit to Paris he was obliged to present himself for the long-deferred interview. Fleury was most gracious on the occasion, and Christophe de Beaumont knew that his doom was sealed; but circumstances procured him a reprieve of three years. While dignities were awaiting him a deplorable act of weakness was the "direful spring of woes unnumbered." Mgr. de Vintimille du Luc, the successor of Cardinal de Noailles in the see of Paris, after the vigorous measures which marked, as has been seen, the commencement of his reign, committed the extravagant folly of using the work of the noted Jansenists, Viger and Mesenguy, in the preparation of a new liturgy expressly designed to supersede the Roman. It was a fatal error which cost France very dear, for it roused the drooping spirits of the adversaries of Roman unity. The melancholy scheme succeeded all too well. Mgr. Vintimille prescribed the use of the new breviary and missal in his arch-diocese, and the provinces quickly followed the example; so that thirty years later the Roman liturgy had been banished from three-fourths of the cathedrals of France, and in fifty-one of the number the Mesenguy-Viger composition was employed.

Christophe de Beaumont was nominated Bishop of Bayonne in August 1741, and received consecration four months later in the chapel of the Benedictine Convent of our Lady of Consolation in Paris at the hands of the Archbishop of Tours, Mgr. Chapt de Rastignac, whose name will be mentioned again. Various causes delayed for more than a year, to the grief of his expectant flock, his arrival at Bayonne. At last in April, 1743, he made his solemn entry amid great demonstrations of welcome. His immediate predecessor, Mgr. de Bellefonds, who had been translated to the see of Arles very much against his own will, had left his memory in good deeds behind him. It was his admirable government of the less important diocese which had marked him out as the man best fitted for the very difficult post to which he was promoted. Christophe de Beaumont found the diocese in good condition, and was only anxious to secure a continuance of the satisfactory state of things. He kept around him the excellent priests who had assisted Mgr. Bellefonds with their good counsels and zealous cooperation; and he entered at once upon the most active performance of all the duties of a faithful pastor. His conduct in a very painful case occurring a few months after his arrival

shows admirably the character of his whole episcopate, in which it was always difficult to say whether firmness in adhering to principle, or gentleness in carrying out what conscience demanded, was the more conspicuous qualification ; so evenly were these two elements of salutary influence united in his example.

Joseph Dailenc, a young advocate in Bayonne belonging to an influential family of which all the kith and kin were steeped in Jansenism, finding himself on his death-bed, applied for the sacraments. His heretical antecedents were well known. To grant his petition without exacting a public retractation of his errors would cause great scandal among the people, and to refuse the sacraments would make a conflagration. First one of the vicars and then another tried to break down the proud opposition of the dying sinner, but in vain. Then the bishop himself made the most strenuous efforts to bring him to repentance. Finally, no course remained except to enforce the law of the Church, and the order was sent to the parish priest to refuse the Viaticum. There was a great cry. The kinsmen were furious, and the whole body of advocates regarded themselves as injured in the person of their comrade. When they tried argument the Bishop had the best of it, and when they threatened evil consequences, he and the curé of the cathedral were alike unmoved. Meantime the poor man died without any sign of repentance. The Jansenists made every effort to arrange a sensational funeral, but the failure was so complete that it was necessary for them to wait till the circumstances were partially forgotten before they could use the example with effect. Many years afterwards the "outrageous behaviour of Mgr. de Beaumont in the case of young Joseph Dailenc at Bayonne" was found to be a convenient reminiscence, but at the time the sincerity of his grief and the evident reluctance with which he proceeded to extreme measures disarmed the resentment of all except the most implacable.

But the see of Bayonne did not long enjoy possession of Mgr. Christophe de Beaumont. The Archbishop of Vienne, Cardinal Henri-Oswald de la Tour d'Auvergne, a very worthy prelate, being far advanced in years, solicited and obtained from Benedict the Fourteenth permission to retire from his episcopal functions in order to prepare for death. The youthful Dauphiness, Maria Teresa, daughter of Philip the Fifth of Spain, who had made the acquaintance of the Bishop of

Bayonne two months before, when she received a very hearty welcome from him and his people on the way to her wedding, showed her appreciation of his loyalty and goodness by demanding that he might be nominated to the vacant archiepiscopal see. The King acceded to her desire. At the end of December, 1745, the enthronization took place, but Christophe de Beaumont was not left long in peace. Mgr. Bellefonds, whose translation from Bayonne to Arles has been mentioned, had been made Archbishop of Paris at the death of Mgr. Vintimille du Luc, but he held this post of dignity and danger only forty-eight days, and died on the 20th of July, 1746. Almost at the same moment the Dauphiness Maria Teresa died two days after the birth of a princess to whom she gave her own name, and the tender regret for her memory was the immediate cause of the appointment of her favourite Christophe de Beaumont to the first see in France. So God disposes great careers by a chain of interwoven accidents. No one was more surprised than Mgr. de Beaumont himself, unless perchance it was the Jansenist leaders who in their indecent exultation at the sudden removal of their great adversary, Mgr. Bellefonds, in which they professed to see the just vengeance of Heaven, little dreamed that Providence was preparing for them a more formidable opponent. They were exerting all their energy to procure the nomination of the Abbé d'Harcourt, but in this they had tried and failed already, and were mercifully allowed to fail again. There were many illustrious names in the hierarchy of France awaiting selection with apparently better claim than could be urged in behalf of the Archbishop of Vienne, who had scarcely had time to survey his new position, and might have esteemed himself safe from further change for a short space of years. The royal nomination took him and his friends completely by surprise. Mgr. Boyer, the chaplain of the departed dauphiness, wrote to him to say that his name would be mentioned to the King. The letter was answered on the spot with an earnest prayer to be left in peace. A second letter drew from him a resolute refusal. Mgr. Boyer represented that his Majesty would be grievously displeased; but Christophe de Beaumont, who could "say nay" very forcibly when he liked, was not to be convinced. He declared that this perpetual shuffling of dioceses was directly against the spirit of the Church. Louis found it necessary to intervene in person, and wrote to his recalcitrant nominee in terms which had more of command than request. This was

in August, 1746. Mgr. de Beaumont saw that remonstrance was unavailing, and contented himself with complaining to his old ally, Mgr. de Mirepoix, of what he called the "treacheries of friendship." Mgr. Boyer, who made no secret of the fact that his personal knowledge of the young Archbishop was very slight, gave his character in a few trenchant words with no more hesitation than if he had known him from childhood. "He is discreet, amiable, methodical, of severe observance and unsuspected orthodoxy, never gambles, and resides with his canons according to rule." The last two commendations were not without meaning in those days, when wealth and power and social rank were in the gift of the Church.

Thus then [said the Jansenist pamphleteer, Nicolas Jouin] Mgr. de Beaumont has changed his bishopric three times within the space of four years ten months and thirteen days. That is what is meant when a man is said to know where he is, and to push his way cleverly; but a little thought strikes me hereupon, of no great practical utility, it must be confessed, in these days, but still not to be omitted, since it has suggested itself: Mgr. de Beaumont was in his diocese either by the will of God, or against the will of God. If he was in it by the will of God, could he abandon it without disobeying God? If he was in it against the will of God, was it not his duty simply to withdraw from it, instead of exchanging one diocese for another?⁹

Bishop Boyer's motives in extending this active patronage to the friend of the late princess were studiously misrepresented. It was declared that he only sought to rule in another's name by placing on the metropolitan throne a prelate who, as owing everything to him, would, without doubt, endeavour to carry out his wishes to every possible extent. Weak compliance with the dictation of friend or foe was no part of the character of the new Archbishop, as all who knew him were perfectly well aware even at the time of his accession. The Duc de Luynes bears witness to the repute of inflexibility of purpose which he had acquired.

The great news of to-day is that the Archbishop of Paris has signified his acceptance. The King's letter has been more efficacious than all the previous representations. That is as it should be, but several of his friends believed that it would not prevail with him. The Archbishop has not answered the King's letter. He thought it a greater

⁹ The man who could leave on record this specimen of his silliness, written not in joke but *au grand sérieux* was put forward by his contemporaries of the Jansenist party as an able controvertist.

testimony of his respect to send a reply to Mgr. de Mirepoix alone. He declares that he will not come here till he has received the bulls. A courier has been despatched to Rome to obtain a consistory from the Pope ; so that there is reason to hope that the bulls will be forthcoming soon.

It must have been a deep consolation to Mgr. de Beaumont to receive from the dean, canons, and chapter of Paris a letter expressing the most complete confidence. This was an unprecedented measure, and having been adopted after mature deliberation, was not in the nature of a mere compliment. "Your repeated refusals," they say, "filled us with alarm and the joy which your acceptance causes is the greater for having been so long delayed." This letter received as it deserved a most gracious answer, and thus the happiest relations were established from the outset between Christophe de Beaumont and his immediate co-operators. The joy with which he was welcomed by good Catholics in Paris was the counterpart of the regret which he left behind in the Church of Vienne from which he had been compelled to part.

The preconisation took place in the Consistory of the 19th of September, 1746, and about a month later the expected bulls arrived from Benedict the Fourteenth. On the 27th of October, Christophe de Beaumont arrived in Paris, and on the 29th he took the oath of allegiance to the King in the chapel of Fontainebleau. The Duke de Luynes, an old courtier, noticed his extreme shyness. The official visit paid in their robes of ceremony by the dean and chapter followed on the 3rd of November, and on the 7th of November the solemn installation took place in the presence of seven bishops or archbishops and a vast concourse of spectators. In conclusion the *Te Deum* was sung, the announcement was made in the usual terms, the bulls were delivered, and the Archbishop was escorted to his palace by the bishops and canons. That same evening he received the pallium from the hands of his old and tried friend and cousin, the Bishop of Blois, Francis de Crussol.

All from the King downward seemed to think that the right man had been found for an Archbishop of Paris, and for the moment the Jansenists put in practice their own doctrine of the "obsequious silence." They could not help acknowledging that Mgr. de Beaumont had prepossessing manners, and that those who knew him best seemed to esteem him most. Like Athanasius, he had been true to

the promise of his early youth, and the "angelic face and more angelic mind" had not been spoiled by contact with a wicked world. The charm was in his simple goodness and humility and truthfulness, which contrasted so nobly with all the empty pride and the littleness and falseness of polite society in the great city which was then as now the central seat of worldliness and petty vanity. He was sincerity itself. He never could stoop to unreality and theatrical effects. No one ever doubted his courage. That was above suspicion, and he gave proof of it at every turn, but he did not make a parade of ~~strepidity~~ ^{strepidity}; and ordinarily the first thing which men observed in him was his extreme gentleness.

He had need of all his high qualities, for there was much to be done which would need more than amiable manners and gentle words for the doing of it. Mgr. Bellefonds, his immediate predecessor, had been carried off by death before he could put his hand to the work of reform which could not fail to have been necessitated by the feeble administration of two prelates whose failing strength in the latter years of their reign was altogether unequal to the duties of so grave a charge. Mgr. Vintimille de Luc was more than ninety years old when he died, and we have seen the egregious folly of which he became capable in the decline of life. Cardinal de Noailles before him had outlived his vigorous days, and he also had committed at least one calamitous mistake in his relations with the Jansenists. He had never shown the good sense or humility required for an honest avowal that in approving Pasquier Quesnel's insidious book of pious reflections he had been deceived into acting upon insufficient information. This drove him into a forced attempt to make subtle distinctions, with the help of Bossuet, in the design of showing that the propositions in the approved book were orthodox, while almost the same words occurring elsewhere were to be branded as heretical. The consequence of all this was that when Mgr. de Beaumont ascended the archiepiscopal throne there were whole parishes and religious communities under his rule which were deeply tainted with heresy.

The Abbé d'Harcourt, Dean of Notre Dame, had not disturbed by any word of his the harmonious expression of welcome with which the Canons had greeted their new Archbishop, but he took an early opportunity of resigning his post, replying to the urgent expostulations of the Chapter:

"I hope you do me the justice to feel sure that, before I came to the resolution of putting back into your hands the office of dean with which you have honoured me, I had given all that diligent attention to the step which its importance demanded." There is some difference of opinion about the sentiments of the Abbé d'Harcourt. It has been said that he had refused the episcopate more than once by humility. This, however, seems to be ascertained, that it was he who suggested to Mgr. Vintimille du Luc the un-Catholic idea of employing Jansenist breviary-reformers, and that he was the staunchest supporter in later years of the breviary so reformed.

Mgr. de Beaumont's first high function was on the anniversary of that death which had caused the choice to fall on him. He would allow no other than himself to sing the Requiem Mass, or preach the funeral oration of his good friend the Dauphiness, and the Bishop of Puy, who had been invited to undertake the latter duty, was superseded. The service lasted three hours. We are not told how much of the time was occupied by the preacher, but those were days of long sermons, when too many Catholics, the King included, thought that they could atone for breaking God's commandments by listening patiently to good advice, and crying, Lord, Lord!

ARTHUR G. KNIGHT.

*"Creature Worship."*¹

PART THE FIRST.

I.

THOSE readers who have followed our remarks on the late publication of Dr. Littledale, may remember that the next point in his argument to which we ought naturally to proceed is that which relates to what he calls generally "creature worship." This head occupies forty-four pages, out of a hundred and ninety-seven, in his book, and is no doubt one of those parts of his argument on which he looks with the greatest satisfaction. We shall endeavour to give some account of it before we proceed to make our own remarks on the subject to which it refers.

Dr. Littledale begins this part of his work by a number of quotations from the Old Testament, in which, as he says, God declares Himself to be a "jealous" God, Who will not give His glory to another, to graven images, and the like. He then adds a number of passages from the New Testament, in which our

¹ This article is a continuation of those which have already appeared under the name of "Irrelevant Controversy." Our readers will already have discovered that it takes a long time to treat the assertions of Dr. Littledale, in his *Plain Reasons*, in the manner in which we have begun. We hope to find something to say on all the heads which were enumerated in our last paper, but, in order to be more at liberty in dealing with these various subjects, we shall drop the general title. It will perhaps not have escaped the reader, that in that paper we omitted to notice the last of the alleged "uncertainties" which, according to Dr. Littledale, make it so unsafe for Anglicans to forsake the secure haven in which it is their happy lot to find themselves, for the more dangerous waters of the Catholic Church. This last uncertainty relates to the doctrine about the Supremacy of St. Peter and of the Holy See, as founded on the comments of the Fathers on the famous passages in the Evangelists which are commonly used by Catholic controversialists. On no point, in our humble conviction, is the evidence for the Catholic doctrine more transparently convincing than on this. But the force of the argument must be considered as a whole, and it must be remembered that these texts have been looked upon as dogmatic and, so to speak, classical texts from the very beginning. The Scriptural argument is simply overwhelming, but it requires from its very fulness a long exposition. In the same way, there is perhaps no one point of Christian doctrine more plainly witnessed to by the Fathers. But here, again, it seems a pity to touch a matter of so much beauty and importance cursorily. The readers who wish for a full exposition should consult the works of Passaglia or Mr. Allies, or others like them. We permit ourselves one remark on the possible difficulties in the

Lord is declared to be the only way of approach to His Father, and so on. He then enumerates the four instances in the New Testament in which either living saints have refused worship, as in the case of St. Peter with Cornelius, and of St. Paul and St. Barnabas with the people at Lystra, or angels have refused such homage, as in the two passages of St. John in the Apocalypse. He adds, on the other hand, that our Lord never refused worship Himself. He argues that the language of Catholic prayers to the saints is not the simple petition for their intercession, but that we directly ask them for favours which it belongs to God alone to confer, and he proves this, as he thinks, from the *Raccolta*, quoting some well-known devotions to our Blessed Lady and to St. Joseph. He then quotes one or two passages from the *Glories of Mary* of St. Alphonsus, which, strangely enough, he calls a "formal theological work," and from other books, which he characterizes as "blasphemy against our Lord, and a formal denial of His power to save and of His being the way to Heaven." Then he adds some passages from early Fathers, against the invocation of the angels and confidence in the saints, though he allows that the "germs" of the practice which he condemns are to be found in St. Gregory of Nazianzus and in St. Gregory of Nyssa. Dr. Littledale then goes on to find fault with what he considers the "Roman inconsistency as to the invocation of saints," which lies in this, that

Fathers. These arise, when they do arise at all, from the fact that the Fathers, in the works which have come down to us, are by no means even generally bringing out, either all the meanings of Scripture texts, or their dogmatic meanings in particular. On the contrary, they are very generally dwelling on moral subjects, and they select those aspects of Scripture texts which suit their purpose, to the exclusion of others. In fact, they often comment on Scripture very much in the way in which a modern preacher would select, from the Gospel of the day, just the points which would suit his desire of instructing his audience on matters of daily conduct. Thus the argument from the silence of a Father as to a dogmatic text, is no argument that he did not hold that interpretation. We make this remark for the sake of truth, not for the sake of this particular controversy. As it happens, in no place of his work has Dr. Littledale so boldly said "the thing that is not," as in that place in which he has asserted that a majority of the Fathers do not apply these famous texts to St. Peter and to his See. He quotes, for instance, ten Fathers as interpreting the rock, in St. Matt. xvi., as of Christ, or faith in Christ. Neither of these interpretations excludes the application to St. Peter. But of the ten Fathers whom Dr. Littledale quotes, all but two actually say exactly what he denies them to say. As it happens, they *do* apply the text to St. Peter. We shall content ourselves with referring to the article in the *Tablet*, February 21, which is said to be from the pen of the learned Oratorian, Father Ryder. Strictly speaking, the question about St. Peter cannot be called a point of irrelevant controversy. But it has been treated by Dr. Littledale in his usual reckless way, and it is difficult to find an accurate statement in his whole section. We proceed to a different subject in the present paper.

the most eminent saints are not invoked so much as some others who he considered ought to be less conspicuous, and he blames the *Raccolta* because there are no indulgenced prayers to St. Gabriel, St. John the Evangelist, St. Stephen, or "St. Mary of Bethany"—meaning, apparently, to distinguish her from St. Mary Magdalene. He objects to the honour paid to St. Pius the Fifth, and to St. Filumena. Then he goes on to the subject of image worship, which he proves, to his own satisfaction, to be idolatrous. He quotes the popular devotion at Rome to the images in the Church of Sta. Maria *del Divino Amore*, and at St. Agostino, to the Bambino at the *Ara Cœli*, and the Madonna at Sta. Maria in Cosmedin. He quotes St. Thomas of Aquin to prove that the Church teaches that the images of our Lord, and the sacred Cross, are to be honoured with the adoration of *latria*, and the images of the saints with the adoration of *dulia*, and ends this part of his work triumphantly with some quotations from the Old Testament prophets against the worship of the dumb stone, &c. Then come a number of passages from early writers about image worship—St. Irenæus, Minucius Felix, Origen, Lactantius, the Council of Elvira, Eusebius, Epiphanius, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, whom he tries to put in contrast with the Council of Trent. He mentions also St. Gregory the Great's letters to Serenus, and finally runs himself full tilt against the Seventh General Council, which condemned Iconoclasm, which Council, he somewhat audaciously says, was rejected by Western Christendom in the Council of Frankfort. Then follows a short section about relics, the chief point of which, naturally enough, under the circumstances, is that there are frequently what seem to be multiplications of the same relic in different places, and then we come at last to the great thesis, "The Blessed Virgin more worshipped than God or Christ."

As to this, it cannot be said that Dr. Littledale minces his words. He accuses the Catholic Church—what he thinks of the Greeks and Russians he does not say, but it must be evident that they cannot be separated from Catholics on this matter—of committing the sin of which St. Paul speaks, when he says of the heathen, that they "worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever." The whole Catholic Church, which he still allows to be the largest part of what *he* calls the Catholic Church, and which he allows to have preserved "the great saving truths," is sunk in the sin of idolatry

as bad as that of the heathen of Greece and Rome, and we do not know why he does not go on to apply the whole of that famous passage of St. Paul to her, for the Apostle there distinctly says that all the vices and abominable lusts and cruelties of the heathen were judicially the punishment of their idolatry. Let us now see how Dr. Littledale proves his thesis, that the Catholic Church worships the Blessed Virgin more than God or Christ. First of all he says, there are in the churches at Rome more festivals in honour of our Lady than in honour of our Lord. Then he adds, what he does not see to be almost the same thing under another form, that there are a hundred and twenty-one churches in Rome whose dedication is to our Lady, and only five to the Blessed Trinity, fifteen to our Lord, four to the Crucifix, two to the Blessed Sacrament, and two to the Holy Ghost. A third proof is that the Rosary consists of a hundred and fifty Hail Marys, only fifteen Our Fathers, and one Creed. A fourth proof is that the Angelus is recited three times a day, and that thus our Blessed Lady is invoked nine times a day, whereas even the Psalmist professed to address God only seven times. A fifth proof that our Lady is more worshipped than God, is that the month of May is observed in her honour, and, by some, the month of September too, that the Offices in honour of our Lady are frequent in the Missal and Breviary, but that those books are, on the whole, a great deal more full of devotion to God and our Lord than of devotion to Mary. But then, he adds, this is not the case with the popular manuals of devotion, with pilgrimages, visits to shrines, and the like.² Dr. Littledale next gives some extracts from St. Alphonsus' *Glories of Mary*, and states that the last words which the Roman ritual puts into the mouth of a dying man are an invocation to the Blessed Virgin.³ Then we come to another

² Cardinal Newman, who really examined the matter before he became a Catholic, says the reverse (*Development*, c. xi. § 2, nn. 3—11).

³ It is difficult to speak with patience of an assertion like this. The Ritual has the following rubric: "When the soul is about to depart from the body, then, more than ever, ought they who are by it to pray earnestly on their knees around the sick man's bed; and, if the dying man be unable to speak, the name of JESUS should constantly be invoked, and such words as the following again and again be repeated in his ear: 'Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit. O Lord Jesus Christ, receive my soul.' 'Holy Mary, pray for me.' 'Holy Mary, Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, do thou defend me from the enemy, and receive me at the hour of death.'" If this verse had been put first instead of last, Dr. Littledale would probably have said that the Church thinks it more important to call on our Lady than on our Lord. The Church is not able to tell at what precise moment of the prayers death will come, and she puts things in their right order. She puts our Lord first, and does not omit our Lady.

section, "The Mass converted into worship of the Blessed Virgin," which is founded on the curious hallucination about the Votive Mass of the Blessed Trinity with which we had occasion to deal some time ago. "This innovation," he goes on to say, is a radical change of religion—in the Church which he elsewhere declares to have preserved "the great saving truths." There remain three long sections. It is evident that Dr. Littledale has a great devotion to our Blessed Lady. He cannot leave her alone. In the first of these three sections he goes through, as he thinks, the Scripture passages in which our Lady is mentioned, for the purpose of pointing out what he conceives to be their real import. In the second, he examines the evidence of the Fathers on the point. In the third, he deals with what he calls the "Roman arguments for Mariolatry," which he states to be three. First, the *a priori* argument—"such a thing ought to be, therefore it is." The second argument, he tells us, is that the worship of the Blessed Virgin is a strong outwork of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and is thus practically useful. And the third argument is from human analogy, that as Christ was subject to His Mother once, He must be so now, just as every dutiful son to his parents, and that she, as Queen, partakes of all the King's privileges and bestows all His bounties. These arguments Dr. Littledale answers in His own way and to his own satisfaction, and thus concludes his attack on what he calls "creature worship."

It will not have escaped the thoughtful reader that there are here several subjects mixed up together, which are kindred indeed one to another, but which, for any clear treatment or discussion, ought to be kept separate. Whether honour is to be paid, and if so, of what kind, to the Blessed Mother of God and to the Saints, is one question,—whether their images and pictures are to be venerated or not in the Church, is another question. "Mariolatry," to use the cant phrase, is not the same thing as "idolatry," and an Iconoclast does not necessarily deny the usefulness of the invocation of the Saints. We must therefore try to separate these questions from each other, and give distinct answers to each. In a certain wide sense, both fall under the general head of "Creature Worship," and we have therefore given that title to these papers, in the first part of which we shall deal with the common Protestant notions about the honour so universally paid among Catholics to our Blessed Lady and, in a lesser degree, to the Saints, reserving for another

part what is to be said about the honouring of images, sacred pictures, and relics. Nor shall we be able in this article to say much about the Saints.

II.

Now we have here a point as to which, perhaps, more than any other, there is a difference which seems to be one of principle between the Catholic Church and Protestantism, a difference which we are very far indeed from wishing to underrate. It is the misfortune, we say it advisedly, of Protestants, among whom as to the present question we must include Anglicans, that their case is so seldom stated with moderation and respectfulness to their adversaries. In a great many of them, as no one can doubt, there is a sincere and honest belief, founded, as they conceive, on Scripture and on their notions of what is due to God, that the practices which are so dear to Catholics are dangerous and unlawful. There is abundant ground for calm and dispassionate inquiry—and yet we find, as a matter of fact, that the literary exponents of these respectable doubts lose all self-restraint, and talk simple Billingsgate. They are in presence of the great Catholic Church of all ages, and yet they begin to foam at the mouth like persons half-possessed. Certainly we have seldom had the good luck to find an Anglican controversialist who did not run almost as wild as Dr. Littledale in his treatment of this point. And yet, certainly, the more learned Anglicans must be aware—whether Dr. Littledale is aware or not—that the whole of what they acknowledge as the Catholic Church is, in principle, against them, and that the whole tribe of the Protestant sects, which they consider outside the Church, is on their side. For it is a matter of notoriety that the Greek formularies are more full of strong expressions about the Blessed Mother of God than are the Roman formularies, and that the popular devotion among the Greeks and Russians goes quite as far as that of the Catholics. East and West are alike as to the devotion to the "Panagia." If Catholics called her "the all holy," Dr. Littledale would probably make an argument out of it. Some modest and moderate Anglican theologians or teachers, however, do not use the language that is used by Dr. Littledale, though they are probably in a real state of perplexity as to the Catholic practice, which, nevertheless, they are too fond of interpreting for themselves, instead of seeking for its explanation where it ought naturally to be found.

This is the cause of their mistake—a deadly one as to their own chance of enlightenment, as well as to all charitable treatment of a matter which is so closely bound up with the daily life of those whom they still claim as their brethren in the faith.

Of course, there is a way of treating these matters of difference which seems to be simply the result of a determination to make the explanation of Catholic practice as difficult as possible. Those who are thus determined must bear their own responsibility. No one is justified in making such misrepresentations as those which we have exposed in our former articles on Dr. Littledale's work, and we are sorry to say that he does not, as we proceed, give us any occasion for complimenting him on his improvement either in fairness or accuracy. In the present subject-matter we have already exposed one flagrant misrepresentation, as to what he calls the "change of the Mass into the worship of the Blessed Virgin." We shall begin our further treatment of him by getting rid of a number of childishnesses, which ought not to find any place in serious controversy. Such, for instance, is the whole section which is headed, "The Blessed Virgin more worshipped than God or Christ." The proof of this assertion is, as has been pointed out, mainly a matter of arithmetic. There are, according to Dr. Littledale, more feasts of our Lady than of our Lord; there are more churches dedicated in her honour than in honour of our Lord, or the Ever Blessed Trinity, or of the Holy Ghost; there are a hundred and fifty Hail Marys in the Rosary, and only fifteen Our Fathers; our Lady is invoked nine times a day in the Angelus, whereas the Psalmist only called on God seven times; and there is a month of May in her honour, "a token of affection and devotion which is not paid even to our Lord." This arithmetical method is one of which Dr. Littledale seems fond. He uses it again later on in his work, where he puts himself to the pains of counting the chapters and verses of St. Peter's Epistles and St. Mark's Gospel, for the purpose of showing that they are fewer than the chapters and verses of St. Paul's Epistles and St. Luke's Gospel. At this rate, St. Paul ought certainly to be set above our Lord Himself, not to speak of the Ever Blessed Trinity. All this, we repeat, is childish—but it is something worse when it is used to the end of insinuating the gravest possible charge that can be made against Christians, that of "worshipping the creature rather than the Creator." There is a fundamental error running

through all that Dr. Littledale has written about our Blessed Lady and the Saints, in reference to the honour paid to them by Christians, and it is this. He pays us the compliment of transferring his schoolboy notions about the Olympian deities to the Christian Heaven. He thinks that we regard our Lady as if she were Cybele or Latona or Juno or Minerva, and the Saints as if they were the "Mars, Bacchus, Apollo," and the rest, of the old Latin Grammar. He thinks that there is a danger that the honour of Jupiter should suffer, because the minor gods have a larger number of temples and festivals than he. What he does not know is, that we have only one God, that He is the object of our worship and prayer in a single incommunicable manner, that our Blessed Lady and all the Saints and Angels are less than a grain of dust in comparison to Him, and that this truth is present to the mind and heart of every Catholic who worships or prays at all anywhere, at any time, and in any way. Any honour paid to them is simply paid to them as honour to Him in another way than that of direct supplication, a way which He has appointed Himself, and in which He chooses to be honoured.

Dr. Littledale's arithmetical argument about churches and festivals is exactly the same with that which we have already exposed. Because there is a special leave for a Votive Mass of the Ever Blessed Trinity to be said, on days when it could not be said without leave, in thanksgiving for the graces which that Ever Blessed Trinity has bestowed on the Mother of God, and because there is over and above an indulgence to be gained by those who assist at this particular Mass, when it is said, therefore the Mass—in which the Blessed Virgin's name is not even mentioned, except in the usual place in the Canon—is "turned into the worship" of the Blessed Virgin. It might be said with exactly as much truth, that the Mass which is said at marriages for the bridegroom and bride, is "turned into the worship" of the bridegroom and bride. It might be said with much more reason that any Mass in honour of any particular saint is turned into the worship of that saint. The whole idea of worship is here radically and grossly misrepresented. In the Catholic Church no worship, in the strict sense of the term, is offered to any one but God. No church is dedicated, in the proper sense of the term, to any one but God. No altar is consecrated, in the strict sense of the term, to any one but God. And the Adorable Sacrifice is not offered to any but to God alone.

Multiply churches, altars, feasts, masses, as much as you can, all are directly and principally addressed to God alone. The name of a church in this makes no more difference than that of a city or a street. The dedication of a church, or the festival of a saint, gives a special occasion for the worship of God in the usual way by the offering to Him of masses, praises, and prayers. Protestants as well as Catholics call their churches by the names of saints, and profess to honour the saints thereby, though it is certainly almost a sarcasm, if not an insult to such saints as St. Chad, St. Augustine of Canterbury, and other English saints, to profess to honour them by giving their names to temples in which so much which they held to be of vital importance is denied. As a matter of fact, we have never heard of a church dedicated to God the Father, and the churches dedicated to the Most Holy Trinity, or to the Eternal Son, or to the Holy Ghost, are comparatively few, for the reason, we suppose, that all churches are primarily temples of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But that our Blessed Lady should hold the first place, after God, in the devotions of the faithful, may be strange to Dr. Littledale, but it cannot surprise any one who has a spark of Catholic feeling in him. The truth seems to be that in the most ancient times the churches were dedicated first of all in honour of the apostles or martyrs of any particular city or town in which they were built. This is the natural order of things. It is, however, found very generally, as it is found in Rome itself, that a very short time elapsed before churches were dedicated in honour of our Blessed Lady. The devotion to the Blessed Mother of God could not wait, and that it should have been so, proves clearly enough that the Christians of the first ages had ideas of her position in the Kingdom of her Son very different indeed from the ideas of Dr. Littledale and other "enemies of Mary," as some of the ancient heretics were called.

The same answer is quite enough to account for the frequency with which her name occurs in Catholic devotions. Catholics do believe, whatever Dr. Littledale may say, that her power with God is altogether incomparable. But there is no devotion whatever practised anywhere in her honour which is not a great deal more in honour of her Son and her Lord. The Rosary is a devotion primarily in honour of our Lord, though it does not, as Dr. Littledale would have it do, and as heretics of all ages have done, separate the Mother from the Son. The

essence of the Rosary lies in the meditations on the mysteries which are therein commemorated, all of which except two are taken from our Lord's history. This, perhaps, which every Catholic child knows, Dr. Littledale does not know. The difference between the Our Father and the Hail Mary is not one that can be counted on the fingers, for in the Our Father we directly address God through our Lord, in the Hail Mary we use the words of St. Gabriel and St. Elisabeth, which Dr. Littledale must think it a great misfortune that St. Luke has recorded, and we add a prayer for the intercession of our Blessed Lady. The same Evangelist has probably drawn his account of the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, the Purification, and the Finding in the Temple, from our Blessed Lady herself. St. John's Gospel tells us how she was present at at least two of the mysteries of the Passion, and we can hardly doubt that she was present at the Ascension as on the Day of Pentecost. This is quite enough to account for the "Rosary" of our Blessed Lady. It was her characteristic gift to "keep all these things, pondering them in her heart," and, that being so, if she had only been one of the saints, and not the Mother of God, she would, according to His usual rule, have a special gift to help others to do the same. Apparently, Dr. Littledale thinks that we should show greater reverence to God by not invoking our Lady and the Saints. The lesser reverence to God is shown by those who put Him on the same level with His creatures, so that the honour given to them for His sake is taken from Him. It is the heretic who degrades God and stints Him of His worship. Such has not been the teaching or the practice of the Church from the earliest times.

III.

Another extremely childish bit of folly—if it were not on so serious a subject, and if it were not essentially connected with a charge against the Church of God which can hardly be considered in itself as less than blasphemous—is the wonderful discovery of Dr. Littledale as to what he calls the revolution in the Christian faith which is involved in the so-called "innovation" which, among other things, has "converted the Mass into worship of the Blessed Virgin." It is, according to Dr. Littledale, a radical change. Well, if it is so, we wonder rather that he allows that the Church has preserved so much of truth as to make salvation possible within her pale. How-

ever, let us hear what he says about this "revolution." Our readers must remember that he is so gentle in his judgments as to take the most indulgent view possible for him. "Judged more gently," he says, "and according to the less extravagant forms, it is at least equivalent to the change in the political constitution of a kingdom or empire, when the personal government of an absolute monarch is suddenly limited and altered into a system like that of Great Britain, where the Sovereign retains indeed the prerogative of highest social rank, but where every actual exercise of substantial authority and bestowal of honours are (*sic*) lodged in the hands of those who are nominally subjects, accountable to the Sovereign, as the Prime Minister, the judges, and so forth, but who are in real fact not only independent of the crown, but dictate its policy, in great and small things alike, from making war and peace down to nominating a tide waiter. And just as it is to the Prime Minister of the day that politicians with us look for place, title, and measures, practically leaving the Queen out of account, so it is with the modern clients of the Blessed Virgin, in the Roman Church, who go to her and not to God."

It is not ourselves who have invented this bit of exquisite nonsense—it is the chosen champion of the High Church party, and of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. This is the Catholic theory, according to Dr. Littledale—*Le Dieu régne, mais ne gouverne pas*. The government of the world has become a constitutional *régime*, and the Monarch of the universe is in fact dictated to by His ministers, and has often to consent to measures and men for which He has no taste. This is not, in our minds, a mere absurdity. It is founded on, and it reveals, the fundamental error very truly and deeply rooted in the ordinary Protestant mind, though, we have seldom seen it put forward with so much crudity as by Dr. Littledale. The thing that makes this nonsense possible is the Protestant idea of God and of His Kingdom, and the entire absence of all knowledge of what is meant by the article of the Creed, in which we profess our faith in the Communion of Saints. It is the idea that God is as little above the highest of His creatures as the Queen is above the highest of her subjects. It is the idea that He is so separated from the Saints and Angels who see His Face in Heaven, that honour paid to them can be anything but honour paid to Him, that requests for their intercession with Him can do anything but

reflect greater honour on Him, Who chooses to allow their power in His Kingdom. It is the idea that the worship, as it is called, of Mary or of Joseph or of the Angels, is anything but a form of worship of Him. It is the idea that there are no beautiful orderings and offices of charity in His Kingdom, that He keeps the various classes of His subjects apart, without choosing to be glorified by the help or the honour which they pay or render one to another, and that although He has bound men on earth together by the strongest ties and duties—resting the administration of His Providence for the poor and the weak very much upon the assistance which they are to receive from the rich or the strong—He has yet allowed of no duties of charity for His own glory between Heaven or Purgatory and earth. This whole idea of God is a low and a heathen idea, little above the "envious and trouble-mongering" deities of Herodotus, and it is no wonder that those who have it may very well consider that we Catholics honour our Blessed Lady as much as they themselves honour our Lord in His Sacred Humanity, or even God Himself. In our humble opinion, and speaking of Protestants in general, they are not far wrong. But the question is, not whether Catholics go beyond Protestant ideas of worship or honour, but whether there is not an impassible gulf in their own ideas between the worship that they pay to God, and the worship, so to call it, which they pay to any creature. The real strength of Dr. Littledale's statements, as addressed to the Protestant mind, is that Protestants have not that high idea of God, and of what is due to Him, which Catholics are taught by nothing so easily as by their own devotion to the saints of God, and especially the Blessed Virgin. The heathen did not know God, because they would not use the visible creation as a lesson-book to learn from concerning Him. Protestants do not know God, because they do not use that far higher "lesson-book" concerning Him which is opened to them by the devotion to the saints, and especially do they not know the Sacred Humanity of Christ, because they do not honour it in its three great results and, if we may so speak, extensions—the Blessed Sacrament, the Blessed Virgin, and the Blessed Saints. Instead of its being true that the honour paid to our Lady derogates from the honour due to her Son or to God, it is true that the honour due to God or to His Son is not paid fully unless it be understood that the honour of our Blessed Lady and of the Saints is a part of it.

We shall illustrate our meaning, by taking one of Dr. Littledale's objections, which has the advantage of being one of those difficulties which naturally rise to the mind of those, of whom it may surely be said, in our Lord's words to the Sadducees, that they "err greatly, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." This objection to the invocation of the saints and of our Blessed Lady is based on the common argument that it is not certain that the saints can hear our prayers. It may be said to those who, like Dr. Pusey and others, admit the intercession of the saints as a fact to which the earliest antiquity bears witness, that, if they intercede for us, it is probable that they know our wants. Indeed, it can hardly be imagined in the Kingdom of God—which is the kingdom of charity, in which every class of God's creatures and servants have some special offices and duties to all other classes, and which also is, in so peculiarly characteristic a way, the kingdom of prayer—that one order of God's children, burning with sympathy for others which are as yet in the battlefield, from which they have themselves passed with victory, should not know the needs and dangers of those who are still in the conflict. But it will be said, God can make the needs of men known to His Saints and Angels, in order that they may intercede for men. This is exactly what we say, when we say that the saints ordinarily know the prayers that are addressed to them by their clients on earth. Here again we come across the radical heathenism of Dr. Littledale's own mind, which makes him impute to Catholics thoughts about the saints which are simply his own. No doubt when the heathen addressed themselves to Apollo or to Pallas, not to speak of "*Pulchra Laverna*," or the "*Diva potens Cypri*," and a thousand other degraded impersonations of lust and greed, they thought that the deities whom they invoked were not only so independent of the Father of Gods as to have different interests from his, but also that they had, as much as he had, the natural and intrinsic power to read their thoughts and grant their requests, whether he liked it or not. These little bits of heathenism Dr. Littledale quietly transplants, as we have said, into the Christian Heaven. He makes us first degrade God, and then he makes us make independent gods of the saints. But no Catholic supposes that the saints have that knowledge of the human heart and soul which God has reserved to Himself, and which He alone has as a natural and indefectible and universal power. Every one allows that, if the saints understand

our needs from what we say and from the aspirations which we form in our hearts, it is because God imparts and communicates to them this power, *hic et nunc*, in the measure in which it pleases Him to communicate it. The difference therefore between saying that the saints hear our prayers, and that they know what are our needs without hearing our prayers, is only that, in the first case God is pleased to encourage us to ask their intercession, and that He chooses, not only to make known to them what we want, but also to allow us to do our part towards making it known to them, by that exercise of charity and devotion in which our invocation of them consists.

Here then there is a distinct increase in the glory of God—the same increase of His glory which is involved in the universal principle of His Kingdom and of His Providence, the principle of using secondary causes and instruments in the preservation and support of His creatures. God could support us without them, but He chooses to make us dependent on them. But to say that God is set aside, because He uses the Saints and is pleased that His children should avail themselves of the aids which He has provided for us in His Saints, is to press, in a carnal and Sadducean manner, the analogy of the limited monarchy of which Dr. Littledale is so fond. His analogy would certainly fail to serve him, if he were to qualify it by the truths which every Christian child knows—if he were to say that every petition to a Minister, in this case, went first through the hands of the Queen, that no Minister could even understand a petition except by special enlightenment from her, and that the wills of the Minister were so absolutely united to hers as to be incapable of forming a wish or consenting to a suggestion without her inspiration and assistance. These are facts in the Kingdom of God which no one but a heretic could deny. Dr. Littledale, apparently, denies them. Let him add them, and he may perhaps see that under such conditions as to prayer and intercession, it would be for the honour of the Sovereign to have such Ministers, and to have their power constantly invoked. Every petition made to them would be asked of her royal bounty by them as well as by the suppliants. Every prayer they made to her in support of the petition would be a fresh act of her condescension, and every royal grace which resulted from such intercession would be a glory to her, in the first instance, and in the second, glory to her through her Ministers, a cause of fresh confidence in her munificence as well as an

instance of her gracious love for her most devoted servants. Dr. Littledale thinks of the saints of God as if they were so many heathen deities, independent of Jupiter as to their power of hearing the prayers of their suppliants, and with wills and desires often contrary to his. This is the idea of the saints of God gravely put forward by a divine of the Anglican Establishment. We can quite believe that Dr. Littledale may come to think that the saints fight, and eat, and drink, and go to sleep, like the deities in Homer or Virgil—and as long as he does so, he is quite unfit either to invoke them or to write about Catholic notions concerning them. It is probable, that Protestants in general have not much clearer ideas about the Blessed Saints, their relations to God, and their offices and their love to us, than Dr. Littledale. No doubt, if they were asked, they would say that the Saints were supremely happy, and that their enjoyment consisted somehow in the love of God. They have no idea that they have a work and an office in the Kingdom of the Incarnation, as the Angels have, and that they do more than casually amuse themselves, now and then, by asking a favour and taking a little interest in the Church. That is, as we have already said, they have no idea of the "Communion of Saints." After all, it might be thought that Scripture had said a good deal on the point, which Protestants, who boast of their knowledge and study of Scripture, might have understood, even if they did not care to learn it from the Church. If they could analyze their own ideas, perhaps they might find that it would be simply unnatural for the Saints to love God and not to care for the advancement of His glory—not to have their own part in that advancement.

IV.

We might make the same general answer to Dr. Littledale's strictures upon the language which is used by Catholics in their addresses to the Blessed Virgin or to the Saints. All these strictures are in a very true sense offensive, for they imply that we do not know the very elements of Christianity in the first place, and that our own explanations of our own words are not to be accepted in the second. Language is essentially conventional in its meaning, and no one has shown this more happily than Cardinal Newman in the speech of Count Potemkin to which we have already alluded. We make no sort of apology for the language of Catholic devotion. The devotion of Catholics

is founded upon their faith, and their faith is quite enough to secure them against the use of blasphemous words in their prayers, or against the denial of the incommunicable and unapproachable privileges of the One God. The devotional language of books like the *Glories of Mary* comes from the heart of the Church, and it is not surprizing that those who do not share her faith or her devotion should not understand her language. But there is a long distance between misunderstanding and misrepresenting, and this, as we shall presently point out, has very frequently been traversed by Dr. Littledale, and we regret very much, on that account, to see him made the representative of his communion in a controversy on the subject. There are plenty of questions which moderate Anglicans may very fairly ask us, but it is a very different thing to garble quotations and then put a false interpretation upon them. If Dr. Littledale had said, "Here are things which I do not understand," and if he had quoted fairly, he would deserve consideration at the hands of every Catholic critic. These are things, certainly, which Protestants do not understand, and cannot be expected to understand. Those who believe the Church to be the Church will be sure that there is an answer. Dr. Littledale is not so modest. He believes the Catholic Church to be a part of the Church—and at the same time he is quite sure that he knows the true meaning of all this to be simple "creature worship" and blasphemy.

There can be no manner of doubt, then, that, not only in popular devotion, but in forms of prayer which have the highest sanction, because they form a part of the offices of the Church, there are expressions to be found, addressed to the Saints or to our Blessed Lady, which in their full meaning apply only to God. The same expressions are entirely true, in a secondary meaning, as addressed to the Saints. What follows from this is that, when these expressions are found put into our mouths to be addressed to the Saints, they are to be understood in the meaning in which they are true, and not in the meaning in which they are false. As a general rule, this secondary meaning is often secured by some expression of less strength which occurs in the context, but this is not always so.⁴ The Church

⁴ Thus, in the *Salve Regina*, for which Dr. Littledale has to go to the *Raccolta*, apparently ignorant that it forms a part of the Divine Office, the words *Advocata Nostra*, occur after our Lady has been called "our Life, our Sweetness, and our Hope." In the versicles after the anthem, by-the-bye, Dr. Littledale commits the

does not think it necessary to be always cautioning her faithful children against the peril of a "creature worship" which never enters into their heads. They know perfectly well that our Lady is nothing at all, except what she is by Divine grace, that she has no power at all, except that which God condescends to allow her, that all her merits and all her glories are through her Son, and are but reflections of His merits and His glories. They might use the strongest expressions of which language is capable regarding her, and they would be no nearer to making any such absurd mistake as that which Dr. Littledale imputes to them. It is not a question of the expressions, but of the sense in which they are used.

At the same time, it must be said, that no one can examine Dr. Littledale's series of quotations on this head without feeling intense indignation at their unfairness, as well as sorrow for the respectable Anglicans who have made themselves responsible for such a writer. Let us take his list from the *Glories of Mary*. He begins, as we have said, by a mis-statement of facts. The *Glories of Mary* is about as unlike a formal theological work as it can be. It is based on the true "Marian" theology of the Church, otherwise it would not be so popular, and it in no way exaggerates theologically the Catholic doctrine about our Blessed Lady. But a formal theological work is not usually full of pious aspirations and "examples" of miraculous intervention. Now let us go on to Dr. Littledale's string of quotations. Dr. Littledale does not help his critics much by giving references, but as far as we have been able to trace him we shall follow him.

Dr. Littledale begins (p. 22) with saying that Mary is called by St. Alphonsus "Queen, Mother, and Spouse of the King, to thee belongs dominion over all creatures." This is a quotation from a sermon of the Abbot Guerricus, a contemporary of St. Bernard. As to this and several other quotations to the same purpose—St. Alphonsus is commenting on the words *Salve Regina, Mater Misericordiae*. No one can read the chapter without seeing in what sense our Lady is a Queen. She is a Queen as Esther was, who won the salvation of her people from Assuerus. This comparison is worked out at considerable length. The chapter is summed up in the words, "Jesus, to pay

convenient error of translating *Dignare me laudare te, Virgo Sacrata*, by "Make me worthy," &c. But we have found several reasons for thinking that his scholarship is not first-rate.

as it were what He owes to Mary (*i.e.*, His Humanity), and glorying in her glory, honours her in a special manner by listening to and granting all her petitions." This ought to have been added in order to give a fair idea of what St. Alphonsus says.

This being the idea of the whole chapter, it is easy to see what we are to think of some other parts of it which Dr. Littledale has quoted. St. Thomas is quoted by St. Alphonsus—the passage is from one of the "dubious" works of St. Thomas—as saying that our Lady, when she conceived and bare our Lord, obtained—"impetravit"—that she should be the Queen of Mercy as Christ is the King of Justice—that is, that our Lord should exercise justice through Himself, and mercy through her—a statement which Dr. Littledale has the temerity to characterize as "blasphemous." Let us hope that he may some day obtain mercy through the Queen of Mercy himself! The same is the natural explanation of the story about the two ladders in the Franciscan annals. It means that our Lady prays for those whose own prayers to our Lord are too timid or too guilty to be heard. Protestants may say that no one is too guilty for our Lord to receive, no one ought to be too timid to have recourse to Him. It is a question of fact, not of what people think ought to be, and here again comes in the miserable heathen idea of the separation between God and the Saints, and between Jesus and Mary. Set aside that heathen idea, and take instead the true Catholic notion, and the doctrine of the Saints now quoted comes to this—that it is an immense help towards obtaining mercy from our Lord to approach Him with the aid of Mary, and that the help of Mary adds a *confidence* to the prayers, of the timid returning sinner which they would otherwise be without.

A few pages further on, we find another batch of quotations from St. Alphonsus. This time it is the chapter in which the Saint comments on the words of the anthem, *Spes nostra*. He begins by a careful theological statement, of which Dr. Littledale does not tell his readers a single word. We can hope in a person, he says, in two ways, as a principal cause, or as a mediate cause. Those who hope for a favour from a King, hope it from him as lord—they hope for it from his minister-favourite as an intercessor. If the favour is granted it comes primarily from the King, but it comes through the instrumentality of the favourite, and in this case, he who seeks

the favour is right in calling his intercessor his "hope." The King of Heaven, being infinite goodness, desires in the highest degree to enrich us with His graces, but, because *confidence* is requisite on our part, and in order to increase it in us, He has given us His own Mother to be our Mother and Advocate, and to her He has given all power to help us, and therefore He wills that we should repose our hope of salvation and of every blessing in her. Those who place their hopes in creatures alone, independently of God, as sinners do, and who, in order to obtain the friendship and favour of a man, fear not to outrage the Divine Majesty, are most certainly cursed by God, as His prophet, Jeremias says. But those who hope in Mary as Mother of God, who is able to obtain graces and eternal life for them, are truly blessed and acceptable to the heart of God, Who delights to see that greatest of His creatures honoured, for she loved and honoured Him in this world more than all men and angels put together. And therefore we justly and reasonably call the Blessed Virgin our Hope, trusting, as Cardinal Bellarmine says, that we shall obtain, through her intercession, that which we should not obtain by our own unaided prayers. "We pray to her," says the learned Suarez, "in order that the dignity of the intercessor may supply for our own unworthiness; so that," he continues, "to implore the Blessed Virgin in such a spirit is not diffidence in the mercy of God, but fear of our own unworthiness."

Now this is not our explanation of St. Alphonsus' words, written after the time to explain them away. These words are the words of the Saint himself, which Dr. Littledale had before his eyes on the opposite page when he quoted without comment or qualification the words of St. Thomas of Villanueva, calling her "our only refuge, help, and asylum." He may not think St. Alphonsus' statement true, but to leave it out for the Protestant public is simple misrepresentation. The same doctrine entirely explains his two next quotations, in one of which our Lady is said to be the one "city of refuge," and in the other she is said by Albertus Magnus to have had reserved to her the office of withholding Him from chastising sinners, and withholding His arm until He is pacified. His next quotation furnishes a remarkable instance of that fairness for which Dr. Littledale is so conspicuous. St. Alphonsus quotes St. Anselm.⁵ "Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be

⁵ *De Excell. Reg.* c. 6.

thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon her name, than we should if we called on the Name of Jesus our Saviour." And the reason he, St. Anselm, gives for it, adds St. Alphonsus, is "that to Jesus as a Judge it belongs also to punish, but mercy alone belongs to the Blessed Virgin as a patroness," meaning, says St. Alphonsus again, "that we more easily find salvation by having recourse to the Mother than by going to the Son, not as if Mary was more powerful than her Son to save us, for we know that Jesus Christ is our only Saviour, and that He alone by His merits has obtained and obtains salvation for us, but it is for this reason, that when we have recourse to Jesus, we consider Him at the same time as our Judge to Whom it belongs also to chastise ungrateful souls, and therefore the *confidence* necessary to be heard may fail us, but when we go to Mary, who has no other office than to compassionate us as Mother of Mercy, and to defend us as our Advocate, our *confidence* is more easily established, and is often greater." Just after this passage, St. Alphonsus quotes another from Nicephorus: "Many things are asked of God and are not granted, they are asked from Mary and are obtained." And how is this? "It is because God has thus decreed to honour His Mother—*non quia potentior, sed quia Deus eam decrevit sic honorare*. Now here, again, we should make no complaint on the score of fairness, if Dr. Littledale gave the whole passages, and disagreed with them. But it is simple misrepresentation to quote the half sentence or the half paragraph which will convey to a Protestant reader an adverse impression, and to leave the explanation unquoted. The same eye which had the one before it on the page of St. Alphonsus must have had the other. The omission must have been deliberate, and it is not easy to understand how it can have been made in the interests of truth.

We have the same wilfulness to point to in the remaining quotations made by Dr. Littledale from the *Glories of Mary*. The text is this: "At the command of the Virgin all things obey, *even God*." And then Dr. Littledale, with scrupulous conscientiousness, adds a note: "As this may be challenged, here is the Latin—*Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, etiam Deus*." With equally scrupulous conscientiousness he does not add that the words came from St. Bernardine, *Serm. de Nat. B.V.M.*, c. 6, and that St. Alphonsus comments on them thus: "St. Bernardine fears not to utter this sentence, meaning indeed

to say, that God *grants the prayers of Mary* as if they were commands." We have yet two more quotations to deal with. St. Alphonsus says, as Dr. Littledale tells us: "The salvation of all depends on their being favoured and protected by Mary. He who is protected by Mary will be saved, he who is not will be lost." Now here again, the foundation, on which rests the doctrine of which this is a specimen has been very carefully laid by St. Alphonsus, and, of course, with equal care, omitted by Dr. Littledale. The Saint goes into the whole question in the beginning of the chapter from which these few words are quoted. His proposition is that the intercession of Mary is not only useful, but even necessary, "we say necessary, not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the will itself of God that all graces that He dispenses should pass by the hands of Mary, according to the opinion of St. Bernard, and which we may now with safety call the general opinion of theologians and learned men." "We willingly admit, that God is the source of every good, and the absolute Master of all graces, and that Mary is a pure creature, who receives whatever she obtains as a pure favour from God. But who can ever deny, that God, in order to exalt this great creature, who more than all others honoured and loved Him during her life, and whom moreover He had chosen to be the Mother of His Son, our common Redeemer, wills that all graces that are granted to those whom He has redeemed should pass through and be dispensed by the hand of Mary. We most readily admit that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator of Justice, according to the distinction just made, and that by His merits He obtains all graces and salvation; but we say that Mary is the Mediatrix of grace, and that, receiving all she obtains through Jesus Christ, and because she prays and asks for it in the name of Jesus Christ, yet, all the same, whatever graces we receive, they come to us through her intercession."

Dr. Littledale must have read all this. He must have thought it either relevant or irrelevant. If he had thought it irrelevant, we may be quite sure he would have said so. He would have said, St. Alphonsus gives this explanation, and it is not to the point, it makes no difference. If he thought it relevant, what are we to think of him for suppressing it? He is a man who is very strong on the point of truthfulness and honesty—in others. In the very page on which we are commenting he goes on to accuse St. Alphonsus of deliberately

falsifying the Fathers. "Carrying into his own practice the maxims of truthfulness which he inculcates on others, he unblushingly ascribes (such expressions) to great Saints and Fathers of the early Church, sometimes on the faith of notorious forgeries, but often without even such a pretext for calumniating their memory." Very well. Dr. Littledale's own language is certainly quite enough to justify a Catholic critic in using some very strong and very short epithets as to himself. We prefer to leave him to the judgment of our readers. We shall only say that St. Alphonsus is a writer who probably has quoted more uniformly and more unsparingly than any author of modern times. He seems to prefer saying even the commonest things in the words of others to saying them in his own words. No doubt, he took his quotations wholesale from his common-place books or from collections made by others, and he may, in a great number of instances, like all writers of his time except those who professed criticism as a calling, have quoted the words of one writer as those of another, or words as certainly by some writer which he did not know to be of doubtful authenticity. All Catholic writers who do not keep controversy before their eyes are liable to this, because, ordinarily speaking, they value the words as witnessing to the mind of the Church, not as coming from a particular writer independently of such a character. But no one who knows anything about St. Alphonsus will ever think of accusing him of dishonesty. Least of all should Dr. Littledale accuse him of dishonesty—and for this reason. Dr. Littledale has himself published about the most untruthful book that it has ever been our fortune to come across. We leave the writer alone—we speak of his book. He by no means generally gives references to his quotations, but we have succeeded in finding—not always—the places to which he refers. When we are able to examine his references, we uniformly find that the author or the book has been either misunderstood or misrepresented. So it was when we examined his reference to the *Raccolta* about the Votive Mass of the Blessed Trinity; so it was when, in our last article on this subject, we examined his statements about the Catholic doctrine of Infallibility, and of intention. So it was especially, when we had, in the same article, to examine a long string of his citations from St. Alphonsus, Busembaum, and others, on matters of moral theology. So it was when Father Ryder examined his statements about the Fathers whom he quoted with reference to St. Peter.

So it has been on the present occasion, and we have not yet got half through the list of his quotations on the subject now before us. "Carrying into his own practice the maxims of truthfulness (!) which he inculcates on others," Dr. Littledale is seldom, if ever, accurate both in statement and in interpretation, and he is usually grossly—shall we say "unblushingly?"—wrong on most material points. A man like this deserves no quarter. We shall content ourselves with saying that we had far rather quote a doubtful or spurious work as genuine, with St. Alphonsus, than insinuate a charge of lying against a Saint of the Church, with Dr. Littledale—especially if we had all the quotations of the *Plain Reasons* to answer for.

V.

We have yet to notice three sections of Dr. Littledale's attack on the Catholic honour to our Blessed Lady—each one of which embraces subject-matter very well worthy of thought and consideration, though it is an irksome duty to have to be perpetually pointing out misrepresentations and unfairnesses as we go on. There is, as all Catholics well-informed concerning the state of mind among Anglicans will readily acknowledge, a great deal in the Scriptural statements, and in the statements of the early Fathers, concerning our Blessed Lady, which requires not so much explanation as development, in order to open to these honest seekers for truth outside the Church mines of truth which they have hitherto not perceived. It is a pity that we cannot discard Dr. Littledale altogether in the treatment of these subjects. As to his last section, which he calls "Roman arguments for Mariolatry," we hardly know on what it is founded. It certainly does not give the reasons for the honour paid to our Blessed Lady in the Church as most Catholics would give them, though even here, when Dr. Littledale sets up his own antagonists to tilt at, he does not by any means overthrow them.

The Scriptural argument concerning our Blessed Lady is treated somewhat in the same arithmetical manner as other points of the question on which we have already had to remark. Dr. Littledale collects the passages in which our Blessed Lady is mentioned, and seems to think that he has demonstrated something or other by the enumeration. This is altogether beside the question. Let Dr. Littledale try to put together a similar catena of texts in which the Holy Ghost is declared to

be God, the Third Person of the Ever Blessed Trinity, and in which there are to be found directions and instructions to Christians to treat Him and invoke Him as God, and he will find that his list is not so long as that which he has produced of texts about our Blessed Lady. The devotion of Catholics to our Blessed Lady, as Cardinal Newman pointed out many years ago in his *Letter to Dr. Pusey*—a letter the simple perusal of which is far more than enough to remove all Dr. Littledale's difficulties—is founded upon doctrine, and the doctrine concerning her dates from the earliest Fathers. We shall speak of the Fathers presently. As to the Scriptural statements concerning our Blessed Lady, it is the same in her case as in that of the Holy Ghost Himself. Scripture informs us that the Holy Ghost is God, and that Mary is the Mother of God, and in each case the simple truth is the foundation of our duties—our duty to honour the Holy Ghost as God, and our duty to honour Mary as the Mother of God. Revelation tells us Who the Divine Persons are, and that being known, it becomes a part of natural religion to honour each Divine Person as God, without any more need of Revelation. In the same way, Scripture informs us that Mary is the Mother of God, and in that one statement is contained the foundation of all our duties to her and all our relations to her.

This is abundantly enough both for Catholic doctrine and for the devotion founded on it. No one but a rabid controversialist would be so foolish as to expect that the Gospel narrative would contain direct instructions as to our devotion to the Blessed Mother of God, any more than about a hundred other points which are to us matters of daily use and experience. If nothing whatever had been said of our Blessed Lady in the Gospels than that she is what she is, the Mother of God, that would be quite enough, considering the general character and laws of God's Kingdom, to show us both her office towards us and our duties to her. As a matter of fact, a great deal more has been said, though not in a great many words. We are told, for instance, that the angel saluted her as "full of grace."⁶ We are told that at the sound of her voice

⁶ Cardinal Newman remarks on this rendering that it is "an interpretation of the original word which is undoubtedly the right one, as soon as we reject the common Protestant assumption that grace is a mere external approbation or acceptance, answering to the word 'favour,' whereas it is, as the Fathers teach, a real inward condition or superadded quality of soul" (*Letter to Dr. Pusey*, 1865, p. 48).

the infant St. John leaped in the womb of his mother St. Elisabeth for joy—a Scriptural statement on which theologians found the Catholic belief that St. John was then sanctified, and endowed with the full use of intelligence. Thus the first great spiritual miracle of our Lord was worked by Him through His Mother, and it is the same with the first of the great visible miracles, the conversion of the water into wine at the feast of Cana. The performance of the miracle was asked for, and, as it were, pressed for, by our Blessed Lady, and it was, if we are to take our Lord's words in their plain sense, performed before the time in consequence. We are also told that our Blessed Lady stood by the Cross, and that one of the few words which our Lord uttered thereon was addressed to her, by which we believe that she was made in some mysterious but most true sense our Mother. Dr. Littledale may not think this, but we are speaking of the Gospel statements by which the Catholic doctrines and devotion are supported. But, we repeat, this doctrine and this devotion are really founded on the position of our Blessed Lady in the Kingdom of her Son, not on this or that particular text, except so far as that position is thereby established. Her position being what it is, the lapse of time which was to pass in the Church before the devotion to our Blessed Lady unfolded itself in this or that precise form, was one of those things which were to be left to the beautiful ordering of God's Providence. The growth was not to be forced prematurely, still less was it to be announced beforehand and inculcated by positive enactment.

The only ghost of a Scriptural argument against this is that which has been so often alleged by Protestant writers, and which has been repeated by Dr. Littledale, that there are certain passages in the Gospels in which our Blessed Lord seems to them either to rebuke or to disparage His Blessed Mother. We hear over and over again about the *Quid est quod Me quærebatis?* when He was found in the Temple—about the *Quid Mihi et tibi, mulier?* at the feast at Cana, and about His words when the woman out of the crowd spoke of the blessedness of the womb which bare Him, or again, when He was told that His Mother and brethren were without, desiring to speak with Him. Our answer to this objection is twofold. In the first place, we believe that on no one of these occasions did our Lord either rebuke or disparage His Blessed Mother in any way. In the second place, if it were true, as it is, we believe, most false, that

those texts are rightly understood in that way, they would have no shadow of reference to the point which we are discussing. The point before us, is the position of our Blessed Lady as the Mother of God in the Kingdom of her Son. That position would not be in the slightest degree affected, if, as we consider most undoubtedly false, she had been over-anxious in seeking for our Lord, or if she had inopportunately pressed for the miracle at Cana, or if she had been too eager in her desire to get to our Lord while He was preaching.⁷

As for the words of our Lord when He corrected the woman who spoke of the blessedness of having been His Mother, it requires a most ingenious perversity to understand them as conveying any reflection on our Blessed Lady at all. The woman meant to praise Him, not her, or at least only to praise her on account of her relationship to Him. The words mean, "Whoever was Thy Mother, blessed must she be!" Our Lord's answer sets aside the praise, and applies it to the purpose of the instruction He is giving. He has just been speaking of the misery of the soul which had heard the word of God, and been delivered by it, and had not kept it, and of the danger incurred by the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. The passage to which this is in many respects parallel, is that in which He is related to have turned off the address, *Magister bone!* by declaring that only God is good. And exactly the same account is to be given of the passage about those who do the will of God being His Mother and brethren. That is, our Lord's words are intended to extol faithfulness to the will of God, not to depreciate His Mother.

The proof that the other passages in no way affect the Catholic doctrine, even if they be understood as implying rebuke—which, as we believe, they do not imply—is that such rebuke would fall on some supposed imperfection in our Lady, and that no such imperfection in her could unmake her position as His Mother, any more than St. Peter's fall unmade his position as the foundation of the Church, or the occasional defects of the Apostles deprive them of the Apostolate. Of course Catholics are ready to do battle unto blood for the sinless perfection of our Blessed Lady, but that is quite a different question

⁷ The passages are, St. Luke ii. 49 (the finding in the temple); St. John ii. 4 (the miracle at Cana); St. Matt. xii. 46 seq., St. Mark iv. 31 seq., St. Luke viii. 19 seq. (the attempt to speak to our Lord while preaching); and St. Luke xi. 27 (the woman speaking from the crowd).

from the question as to her position and office. She has those as the Mother of God, and they would be no less hers on account of any such incidents as are supposed by the enemies of her honour. Their attack really falls on her saintliness, not on her prerogatives, and it only shows their extreme anxiety to cast doubt upon the latter that they should use arguments of this kind.

What is true about the Scriptural argument is also true about that which is to be drawn from the language of the early Fathers and writers. As to this point, we have to notice the method which Dr. Littledale pursues—and which he is wise in pursuing, for it is the only method open to him. This method is quietly to ignore what has been written on the Catholic side, and to repeat oft-refuted misstatements with that "unblushingness" which he attributes to St. Alphonsus. Even here this is not all, for here again, as everywhere, when he is examined, he is found to state "the thing that is not." Few things that even Cardinal Newman has written are more beautiful and more conclusive than the part of his *Letter to Dr. Pusey* in which he establishes the doctrine that our Lady is the second Eve, as being the doctrine of the very earliest ages. He finds it in Palestine, Africa, and Rome, taught as a matter of tradition by Tertullian, St. Justin Martyr, and St. Irenæus, and gives very good reason for thinking that the Apostolic origin of the doctrine cannot be doubted. The doctrine is full-blown, so to speak, and taught with an antithetical precision, which reminds us, as the Cardinal remarks, of St. Paul's contrast between Adam and our Lord. "It is well to observe," says the Cardinal, "the particular words under which the Blessed Virgin's office is described. Tertullian says that Mary 'blotted out' Eve's fault, and 'brought back the female race' or 'the human race to salvation'; and St. Irenæus says that 'by obedience she was the cause or occasion' (whatever was the original Greek word) 'of salvation to herself and the whole human race,' that by her the human race is saved, that by her Eve's complication is disentangled, and that she is Eve's advocate, or friend in need. It is supposed by critics, Protestant as well as Catholic, that the Greek word for 'advocate' in the original was Paraclete; it should be borne in mind, then, when we are accused of giving our Lady the titles and offices of her Son, that St. Irenæus bestows upon her the special name and office proper to the Holy Ghost."⁸

⁸ *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, pp. 39.

All this, of course, might as well never have been written, for all that Dr. Littledale cares. The curious thing is that, whereas Cardinal Newman's argument is rested on incontrovertible texts of these three early Fathers, Dr. Littledale's account of the matter is as follows: "St. Justin Martyr mentions her twice in connection with the Nativity, and once with the Flight into Egypt. . . . Tertullian mentions her four times, once in connection with the Nativity, once merely to defend the occasional interchangeableness of the words 'woman' and 'virgin,' by showing that both are applied to her,⁹ but twice actually to charge her with lack of belief, and with seeking to call Christ away from His work,¹⁰ thereby avowing His indignation." We have already pointed out that the doctrine as to the office of our Blessed Lady is a different thing altogether from the doctrine of her sinlessness. The two are confused in this passage by Dr. Littledale, and we may have something to say hereafter as to his representation of Tertullian as to the point which is relevant to our discussion. But the thing to be chiefly observed is his courageous silence as to the witness of Tertullian and St. Justin to the doctrine as to her office in the Kingdom of her Son. He makes the same confusion as to St. Irenæus, whose witness to the doctrine drawn out by Cardinal Newman he does, at last, mention. "St. Irenæus," he tells us, "says that St. Mary's obedience counterbalances Eve's disobedience, so that she has become the 'Advocate' of Eve."¹¹ But he adds, "We have only the barbarous Latin translation here, and cannot tell exactly what the Saint wrote or intended." Indeed! "But we have his mind plainly enough expressed in another place, when he speaks of Christ having 'checked the unseasonable haste' of His Mother at Cana." This is extremely good. It is, as we have already said, altogether beside the point as to the office of our Blessed Lady to quote texts as to her having been "unseasonable," but here, apparently, the "barbarous Latin translation" is plain enough, because it seems to suit the purpose of Dr. Littledale to have it so. Twist St. Irenæus' words as much as he can, there is nothing in them against our Blessed Lady, much less against her office. The Saint is speaking of the absence of all "unseasonableness" in our Lord, *nihil incommptum atque intempestivum apud Eum*, and he gives several instances, in which, as he says, our Lord

⁹ *De Velandis Virg.* vi.

¹⁰ *De Carne Christi* vii. Adv. Marc. iv. 19.

¹¹ *Contr. Her.* v. 19.

accomplished exactly at the time pre-ordained by the Father, this or that work. He says our Lady was hastening on to the marvellous sign of the wine, and wishing to partake of the new cup before the time—an eagerness which shows her wonderful faith and desire for His glory—"and that He repelled her *intempestivam festinationem*," saying that His time was not yet come. It is not true, as Dr. Littledale asserts, that there is one passage only of St. Irenæus in which the contrast between Eve and Mary is set forth, nor is it true that there is the slightest ambiguity as to the doctrine of that Father. The import of the "barbarous Latin" is perfectly plain to those who are not wilfully blind. The only doubt is as to the exact Greek word which corresponds to "advocate," and the exact word does not affect the question of the doctrine.

VI.

If any one were to wish to see a contrast between, on the one hand, real Patristic learning and careful treatment of texts, joined to discriminating criticism on the circumstances and characters of early writers, and, on the other, that pretentious grouping of names and that carelessness—to say no more—in quotation which are the characteristics of the mere sciolist, we should recommend him to refer to Cardinal Newman's account of the language of some early Fathers as to our Blessed Lady for the one, and to Dr. Littledale's treatment of nearly the same texts for the other. Cardinal Newman quotes his passages accurately and fully, he gives their weight to difficulties, and he considers the circumstances, the training, and the position of the several writers with admirable and exquisite critical judgment. Dr. Littledale lumps a number of names together, in the first place, and tells us, not that they say anything against the Catholic doctrine, which they do not, but that they say nothing about it. "St. Barnabas, St. Hermas, St. Clement of Rome, St. Polycarp, Tatian, Athanagorus, Theophilus, St. Hippolytus, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, St. Dionysius, Arnobius, and St. Methodius." What a jumble! He does not tell his readers how many pages we have of some of these writers, how many of them are simple apologists for the Christian religion, and untheological apologists too, how many others are merely concerned with particular questions, of the day. Perhaps not one of them could be named of whom

it could be said that he might be expected to treat the question. Then he comes to St. Justin, who is one of the Fathers who does witness to our Lady's position as the Second Eve, and of this he says nothing. We have seen how he misrepresents, in the same way, Tertullian. He quotes Origen, as implying that our Lady might doubt at the Passion—what has that to do with the doctrine we are speaking of! We have also seen how he misrepresents St. Irenæus. Then he allows that St. Cyril of Jerusalem calls her Theotocos—but he leaves out that he also is a witness to the tradition about the Second Eve. Then he quotes a passage from St. Hilary of Poitiers, who interprets the "sword" in the prophecy of Simeon of the judgment of God. St. Hilary certainly seems to place our Lady above the rest of mankind by arguing that *even* she has to be judged, but Dr. Littledale sees in that statement something inconsistent with the Catholic doctrine. He has keener eyes than Catholics themselves. Then comes a quotation from St. Epiphanius about the Collyridians, which he does not translate very well. The passage has nothing whatever to do with the Catholic doctrine. It is against giving *Divine* honours to our Blessed Lady. Then we have the passages in St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, Dr. Newman's exposition of which is so singularly fair and lucid. Of this exposition, of course, Dr. Littledale says not one word. He adds a paragraph from St. Gregory of Nyssa, to the effect that "nothing created is to be worshipped by man," which has even less to do with our Blessed Lady than the passage from St. Epiphanius; and another from a commentary of St. Jerome on St. Luke which he must have discovered for himself, for it is a work quite unknown to the editors and readers of that great Father.¹² And then he states that St. Augustine, St. Leo, and St. Gregory the Great, say nothing to "favour the *cultus*." We may say that we are not arguing about the *cultus*, but about the doctrine on which the devotion is founded, and that, as to that point, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine are all quoted by Cardinal Newman as witnesses to the tradition which he has traced as far back as St. Justin and St. Irenæus, and through them, to the

¹² There is to be found a short commentary on the several Evangelists at the end of St. Jerome's works, a commentary undoubtedly spurious. Even this contains nothing like what Dr. Littledale asserts it to contain. Thus, to use his own words, he first "unblushingly" ascribes to St. Jerome expressions he never used, and when the spurious work is examined, in the second place, it is found to furnish no pretext at all for this "calumny on the Saint's memory."

Apostles themselves. Moreover, we must argue fairly. If some passages which occur in certain Fathers, in which some kind of sin or imperfection is attributed to our Blessed Lady, are to be taken as arguments against her great position in her Son's Kingdom—which is Dr. Littledale's argument—then passages which declare her to be out of the question where sin is concerned must be taken as supporting the Catholic doctrine as to that great position. Dr. Littledale quotes some words of St. Chrysostom—about the most inexplicable words which can be quoted in this subject-matter—in which that saint attributes to our Blessed Lady "arrogance" and ambition, Dr. Littledale adds, "the Church has not followed St. Chrysostom in this view, which is a most painful one, but the fact that his having advanced it has in no way prevented his being regarded as a great Saint and Doctor of the Church, and is conclusive that no worship of the Blessed Virgin can have been permitted in his day." We have said more than once that this argument is fallacious. The honour paid to our Lady is independent of casual interpretation of particular texts as to her conduct. But on Dr. Littledale's ground, what can he say to St. Augustine, who declares against all sin in connection with our Lady? "All have sinned," he says, "except the Holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom, for the honour of the Lord, I wish no question to be raised at all, when we are treating of sins."¹³

We have already said that Dr. Littledale's attack on Catholicism is formed on the principle of repeating all the old charges that he can pick up, and entirely ignoring the answers that have been made to them. One of the most reckless things ever done by Dr. Pusey was his quoting several almost entirely unknown authors as instances of extravagant devotion to our Blessed Lady among Catholics, leaving out of sight the fact that they were writers of comparatively no importance, and that one at least of them had been placed on the Index. Dr. Littledale, notwithstanding this fact—which has frequently been exposed, though up to the present moment Dr. Pusey has not withdrawn his statements—faithfully follows his leader in referring to these writers.¹⁴ What is to our present point is that the passages which he cites from some of the great Fathers already mentioned, passages which imply that, speaking *obiter*, or in the course of their interpretation of some Scripture passages, they did not shrink from imputing or suggesting either

¹³ *De Nat. et Grat.* 42.

¹⁴ P. 46.

imperfections or faults to our Blessed Lady, have been dealt with most fully and satisfactorily by Cardinal Newman in the work to which we have more than once referred. We can add nothing to that perfect exposition of the difficulties, and of their really small importance, and we therefore content ourselves with referring to the Appendix to the *Letter to Dr. Pusey* on the present occasion. We consider that those passages belong to the class of "commentaries" of which we have spoken in the note at the beginning of this article—commentaries which give an interpretation which lies on the surface, and which lend themselves readily to the purposes of the moral exposition of the preacher, or to the argument which the Father is then pursuing, though they are not those which would have been adopted by the same writers if they had been addressing themselves to a thorough dogmatic and critical explanation of the text, with full consideration of all the context and of the circumstances under which the words which are commented on were spoken. And, allowing them the full weight which attaches to the names of the writers from whom they proceed, they are in no sense witnesses to any tradition, nor do they in any degree touch the question on which we are occupied, that of the position of our Blessed Lady in the Kingdom of the Incarnation. This position is solidly established by Scripture and Catholic tradition from the earliest times. And, before we part from this question, we may entreat the readers of Dr. Littledale to look at another Appendix in Cardinal Newman's famous *Letter*, that in which he collects the testimonies to the position of our Lady, which are to be found in the ancient Greek Liturgies and books of prayer. Some of these bear the names of the very saints whom Dr. Littledale quotes as witnessing to the absence of all devotion to our Blessed Lady in their time. There is scarcely a point among those which Dr. Littledale has so unfairly selected from St. Alphonsus and other writers which might not be defended by these ancient prayers, which are not private and popular devotions, but prayers solemnly used by the various Eastern Churches in the Liturgy. What would Dr. Littledale say to St. Alphonsus if he found him praying God to "have mercy on us, through the Theotocos," or saying, as is said in the Rite of St. Chrysostom, at the Offertory of the Mass itself, "in honour and memory of our singularly blessed and glorious Queen, Mary Theotocos and Ever Virgin, at whose intercession, O Lord, receive, O Lord, this sacrifice unto Thy altar which is beyond the heavens." Or again, at

the end of Mass, in the Ethiopic Rite, "Praise to Mary, who is the glory of us all, who has brought forth for us the Eucharist;" or again, "Show forth thy speedy protection and aid and mercy on thy servants, and still the waves, thou pure one, of vain thoughts, and raise up my fallen soul, O Mother of God. For I know, O Virgin, I know that thou hast power for whatever thou wilt."

Such are the words in which the devotion of the Eastern Churches and Eastern Christians is expressed—words, as Cardinal Newman has pointed out, more ancient than the date of that separation of East and West, up to which, according to the fanciful theory of modern Anglicans, the Church of Jesus Christ retained the purity and the authority which is her great and chief inheritance—only to lose it because Photius, like a hundred others before him, chose to become and to remain a schismatic. We have only quoted a few from the large number of specimens cited by Cardinal Newman. They ought, at the very least, to open the eyes, not of Dr. Littledale, but of many whom he is put forward to mislead, to the truth that what they call Mariolatry is really as old as the Church, and that the whole mind and heart of Eastern Christendom, as they consider it, are against them, in their low estimate of the position which the Blessed Mother of God holds in His kingdom. They may say that Anglicans, and Greeks, and Romans, make up the Catholic Church. Well then, what is the mind of the whole Catholic Church, except themselves, as to this most important point?

The truth is, as has been already implied, that we have here one of the greatest of the crimes which has been committed by the Anglican Establishment in its dealings with the Christian souls over which it has usurped authority and influence. The blow which was aimed at the supremacy of St. Peter has blighted all the purest, the most beautiful, the most beneficial of the devotions which spring, like flowers of Paradise, in minds enlightened by the true faith and warmed by true charity. Anglicans have lost a large number of the instincts natural to Christians in their rejection of Catholic unity, and their practical perception of the articles of the Creed and of the duties which those articles involve is largely impaired. A Catholic Christian of any time or any country shrinks with horror from the idea of schism—but Anglicans are so accustomed to separation from the rest of what they consider the Church that they talk almost with complacency of her "broken

unity." Their pet phrase itself, the "Holy Undivided Church," by which they mean a thing of the past, shows that they believe the Church to be no longer One. And, as they have lost the truth of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church, so also have they lost that of the Communion of Saints. This is the fundamental truth which is wanting in all their conceptions about our Blessed Lady and the Saints. The Church is not to them the living Body which St. Paul is so fond of describing, every part of which has an office to every other part, nor do they feel themselves practically "fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the Household of God." Except for this mournful instinct, on the working of which, in bodies outside the Church which have no Priesthood and no Sacrifice, Father Hutton has made some valuable remarks in his late book on Anglican Orders—except for this, there could have been no necessary reason for the utter difference as to devotion to our Blessed Lady and the Saints, which in fact exists between the best Anglicans of the present day and the Catholics of the Middle Ages, of whom they claim to be the legitimate descendants. We have witnessed, in our own day, an attempt on the part of a small school among them to "revive" (!) the doctrine of the Priesthood and the Sacrifice—in the teeth of the plainest facts of history and the most unqualified declarations of their own formularies. There is but little in the Anglican formularies, except the universal excision of all invocations—even the *Hail Mary!*—and a nasty word or two in the Articles—for which High Anglicans care nothing—to prevent any attempt at a similar development of a devotion which they must well know to be universal in the whole Church—as they consider it—except among themselves. It has often struck Catholics with wonder that good Anglicans can allow themselves to go on practically declaring that they wish to have nothing to do with the Mother of God and with His Saints. The phases of the movement which goes by the name of "Ritualism" are so fantastic, that we can never tell what may come next. But we fear that these good people have an instinctive feeling that devotion to our Blessed Lady would very soon land them outside the boundaries of Anglicanism. *Gaude, Maria Virgo! cunctas hæreses sola interemisti in universo mundo.* But it would be more profitable for men in Dr. Littledale's position to make some effort to assimilate their fellow-religionists to Catholics in this respect, than to spend so much labour upon extravagant charges, founded, in so large a measure, upon false statements and garbled quotations.

Three Yorkshire Abbeys.

A FEW hours past we were in the roar and fevered agitation of London; we are sitting now upon the green grass, in perfect quiet, broken only by the songs of birds, leaves over head, and at our feet a narrow valley and a winding stream. Coming out of the great world, this would suffice to give rest and calm; but there is a special charm here, a charm not, however, wholly unmixed with bitterness, for rising out of that narrow valley, amidst embowering trees, are the grey abbey ruins of roofless Rievaulx.¹ "Progress and civilization" must indeed have wrought sorely with the heart of any man who can look upon this scene and be unmoved! Amidst the loveliest spots of this dear land of England, surely none can there be lovelier than this, none with such a special grace, such singular and tranquil beauty! Three narrow vales meet, coming down from

Beyond the utmost purple rim

of the heather-clad Hambleton hills, each bringing its little tributary runlet into the valley of the River Rye. Down along the banks, feathered with aspen and birch, decked with ferns and wild flowers, lie narrow meadows with tranquil browsing cattle, whilst strips of culture rise irregularly up the sloping sides of the valley, till they meet the woods which clothe the steepening ascent where

Enormous elm-tree boles do stoop and lean
Upon the dusky brushwood underneath,
Their broad curved branches fledged with clearest green,
New from its silken sheath.

Tender blue smoke curls upward from this depth of verdure from lowly cottages, a handful of which, with gardens all aflower, cluster about what is left of one of the noblest of the great Cistercian abbeys of Catholic England.

Let us, as we gaze in rapture upon this exquisite picture,

¹ Rie-Vaulx—Rye-Valleys.

briefly take up the threads of the story which tells how this great abbey came to be founded to God's glory, in far off olden times, in this hidden and lovely valley of the Rye. In the reign of Henry the First there lived a certain knight named Walter L'Espece, and his wife Adeline, with an only son. Chasing the wild boar at a place known as Frithby, or Firby Cross, Sir Walter saw his child killed by a fall from his horse (1122). As in those days of faith the first thought in grief and trial was of God and His Church, the good knight vowed "to make Christ his heir," and established the Augustinian Canons where his son fell, at Kirkham, or the Church Meadow. The high altar of the church was raised on the actual spot whence the lifeless body was lifted from the ground. Nine years elapsed, but the wounded heart of the father was still unhealed, and he founded Rievaulx (1131), and the great St. Bernard sent a swarm of his spiritual children from far-off Clairvaux to this new hive, to store the honey of the love and service of God. But L'Espece had more yet to do for God's dear love and his child's soul, and in 1136 he founded another Cistercian abbey at Warden in Bedfordshire. But whilst this true Christian knight thus wrought for God, he had not laid down his trusty sword, and we find him on the battle-field of Cowton beneath the standard of the Cross, which bore suspended from its arms the Sacred Host. Amongst the English knights who fought on that memorable field of the Battle of the Standard (1138), none distinguished themselves for prowess more than Walter L'Espece. "Tall and large," as his friend Abbot Ailred describes him, "with black hair, a great beard, and a voice like a trumpet," he harangued his fellow knights and followers from the foot of the Cross, and "pledged his troth to conquer or to die." The Scots were scattered, and he came unscathed out of the fierce fight, but it was to give himself to God. Meanwhile the walls of Rievaulx had risen, so he put by his good sword, presented himself as a postulant, was clothed in the white habit of St. Bernard, and as a monk he died in 1153, and sleeps in an unknown grave amidst the ruins of his own foundation.

Thurstan, the great Archbishop of York, had received the colony on its arrival from Burgundy, as the friend both of St. Bernard and of Sir Walter L'Espece, and what was then a waste of trackless moorland or tangled forest, spreading far across the neighbouring hills and forming a territory of some thousand acres, was handed over to the Cistercians. "Give

these monks," said Giraldus de Barri, "a naked moor or a wild wood, then let a few years pass away, and you will find not only beautiful churches, but dwellings of men built around them."² And so it was. With indomitable energy and perseverance they set to work. The valley was cleared for a space, foundations dug, materials collected. Faint traces of earthworks following the line of the river remain to show how, as tradition still repeats, an artificial canal was made along the valley to float up the Yorkshire limestone of which the abbey is built. Ecclesiastical architecture was tending to the period of its perfection, and in this far off, hidden place—*vastæ solitudinis*—it is simply marvellous to find such a gem—shattered and broken withal—of this the eldest and noblest sister of the triple arts, as is to be seen in the choir of Rievaulx. Let us wind down amidst the trees from the vast sweep of the grassy terrace whence we have looked down, and explore this ruined, but still lovely shrine.

We come first upon the site of the nave; but it is wholly destroyed, and marked only by green mounds of turf. Beyond, perfect in form and proportion, rises up the transept arch, whilst on either hand are the relics of the stern Norman transepts of the original foundation, and from these stretch onwards, exquisite in design and delicate in detail, the fourteen early-pointed arches of the choir. The high bowed vault of stone has long ago fallen, and its sculptured key-stones lie low, but two flying buttresses still span the site of the choir aisle, with the curve of a rainbow or of a fountain jet. In the graceful triforium the refined and delicate mouldings of arch and column are yet perfect as when they left the chisel of the monastic mason. Down in the rank grass, and for years past exposed to every indignity, still lies, where it was of old set up and anointed, the massive altar stone. Masses of fallen walls and carved stone-work are piled about, and festoons of ivy clothe the ruined walls as if with tapestry. But even amidst this decay, the memory of the indwelling of the Most Blessed Sacrament for some five centuries, and the chaunt of prayer, and the odour of incense, seem to linger to those whose spirit is quickened by the gift of faith.

To the west³ of the nave stretches out the green sward of

² *English Minsters*, Walcott, vol. ii. p. 13.

³ It is worth notice, as in contrast to the purism of certain "revivers of Gothic architecture" of our own day, that this great church—343 feet in length—stands north and south, as being better adapted to the lie of the narrow valley than the more usual but by no means imperative position of east and west.

what was the cloister garth, enclosed to the north by what were the guest chambers, stores, and dormitory of the lay-brothers, to the south by the sacristy and chapter-house, amidst the ruins of which, by tradition, rest the mortal remains of Walter l'Espece. To the west of the cloister are the walls of the kitchen, with its vast calcined hearth cold and chill, and, over the ruins of a range of vaulted cellars, the exquisite refectory, with its shattered reading pulpit, and at its door the remains of the spacious lavatory. Stretching away to the south west, lie in confused heaps, with here and there a fragment of wall or a buttress, or a doorway half blocked with fallen masonry, the greater dormitory, the abbot's lodgings, and other appurtenances of the monastic buildings the object of which it is now all but impossible to unravel. It is deeply interesting to compare these lifeless and desolate fragments of Rievaulx, in the Yorkshire valley, with the recorded plan⁴ of its mother house at Clairvaux, as St. Bernard left it at the end of the twelfth century—for unfortunately the building was reconstructed in the eighteenth. Church, chapter-house, refectory, dormitory, cloisters, all occupy identical positions, and besides the fidelity which thus carried these traditions across land and sea, there is something very touching in this affectionate adherence to the familiar home plan afar off, with all its associations, not to be forgotten even by the stern Cistercian. But there was much more than mere sentiment in the disposition of these various component parts of a Cistercian abbey. The Constitutions of the Order, drawn up just twelve years before Rievaulx was founded, at the first General Chapter of Cîteaux, 1119, at which St. Bernard took part with eleven Abbots of the Order, gave the most precise and masterly instructions as to the arrangement and design of their monasteries, and a careful study of their plans reveals a profound sense of fitness, utility, and economy of space and time, such as modern "professors," might well study and endeavour to master. But it is not only in the structures raised by their hands that the Cistercians are to be studied and admired. Much of their time was devoted to the arduous task of reclaiming forests and waste lands, breeding and tending flocks and herds, and other agricultural and pastoral duties, and, moreover, the extraction and working of iron wherever ore was to be found. Nor must it be concluded that the monks of St. Bernard despised or neglected intellectual culture. Whilst

⁴ See Viollet le Duc, *Dictionnaire d'Architecture*, vol. i. p. 267.

at Rievaulx the heaps of furnace slag and the spot known to this day as "the forge," and the still visible embankments which formed the ancient fish ponds, the mill race, and the canal for the water carriage of building materials of which we spoke above, tell of manual toil, so surely, amidst the tumbled ruins we find the sites of the library, *scriptorium*, and hall for theological discussions of theses. It was in these latter that doubtless the two first Abbots wrote their reports of the growth of the new foundation to their personal friend, St. Bernard, or St. Ailred, the third Abbot (1145—1157), penned his *Speculum Charitatis* or his *Descriptio de Bello apud Standardum*. Whether afield or in cloister, the good name and fame of the monks of Rievaulx spread far and wide, and rich and poor came over the heath-clad hills and through the dense forests of Yorkshire, to this home of prayer and of patient toil for the love of God. At last the fatal hour of persecution and dissolution came. Richard de Blyton, the last Abbot, laid down his life on the scaffold, and the annual rental—in money of the period—of £351 14s. 6d., was swept into the money bags of the founder of the Church "by law established." The results—as we see them to-day, in place of a glorious church, from which ascended unceasing prayer, with a vast group of admirably constructed buildings, of which learning, hospitality, and charity were the inmates—are an utter ruin, and a Primitive Methodist meeting-house.

We will quit the valley of the Rye, and the wild Hambleton hills, for the more pastoral scenes of the western dales of Yorkshire. Passing many a ruined abbey or its site, we find ourselves, hard by the River Yore or Ure, at the abbey of Jervaulx (Yor-Vallis). Founded in 1150, or thirty-one years later than Rievaulx, this was another branch of the family of St. Bernard's wonderful reform. "From the marshy forest (at Citeaux), where the twenty-one religious from Molesmes had built some wooden huts, and cultivated a patch of land, within a space of twenty-five years went forth over sixty thousand Cistercian monks, who spread from the Tiber to the Volga, from the Mançanarez to the Baltic,"⁵ and far beyond, into every nook and corner of Catholic England, from Beaulieu and Netley, to Byland and Neath. Two thousand houses of white-robed monks and nuns obeyed the statutes of Citeaux, and served God under its ascetic and simple rule. As Rievaulx sprang from Clairvaux, Jervaulx derived its origin from

⁵ Viollet le Duc, *Dictionnaire d'Architecture*, vol. i. p. 265.

Savigny. The builder of the stern castle keep of Richmond in Yorkshire, Conan of Brittany, the fifth Earl of Richmond, was the giver of the actual site in the pleasant meadows beside the broad and sparkling Ure. This was in 1156. Six years previously the new colony had arrived from Savigny, called thence by Akar Fitzbardolph, their first settlement being higher up the Dales, at Fors. This they left for Jervaulx, keeping up only a cell at the former place. In contrast to the narrow and lonely valley in which Rievaulx nestles, and which we have feebly endeavoured to describe above, Jervaulx lies in a wide and open vale, spreading out to the gently sloping hills which there lie wide apart, but gather in beyond to the west, and form the lovely series of valleys known as "the Yorkshire Dales." Rich pastures and noble trees stretch like a sea of verdure on either hand of the fertilizing river, rising in long undulations till here and there grey crags form a kind of mural crown to the green valleys. Many a church tower or feudal battlement shows its hoary wall from the embowering foliage, and tranquil farmsteads dot the landscape. But if the general aspect is more smiling and less limited as to space than at Rievaulx, the ruined abbey at Jervaulx is more desolate in its almost utter destruction. The ruthless hands of wanton waste or stolid utilitarianism have hardly left a stone upon a stone, and the ground plan, of the Church especially, is only traced just above its original level by comparatively recent excavations. Still the interest of what is left is very great, and the very amount of destruction seems to appeal to the feelings with a deeper pathos. *Egressus est a filia Sion omnis decor ejus. Vide, Domine, et considera quoniam facta sum vilis!* Happily, what is left of the vast wreck is now carefully tended and watched over, and though perhaps one might be disposed to complain of the "tea-garden" style in which the venerable ruins are set in neatly gravelled walks and close cut lawns, the intention is so clearly good that criticism is disarmed.

Mapped out upon the green sward it is not difficult to trace the plan, all the less with the arrangement of Rievaulx before our mind, for it is almost identical, and adheres to the established and prescribed Cistercian ichnography. There is, however, one striking difference in the ground-plan of the church, for whereas at Rievaulx there is a vast choir 144 feet long, Jervaulx has but a comparatively shallow "presbytery," as at Byland and Kirkdale at home, and Clairvaux and

Fontenay abroad. The choir of the monks and the "retro-chorus" for the sick were in the upper or eastern portion of the nave.⁶ And the characteristic Cistercian feature is the absence of the Lady Chapel beyond the high altar, though the altar stood detached, and admitted in certain cases of an ambulatory, or "procession path," behind it, as we find at Byland. The pyx, in which the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, was suspended over the altar enveloped in a linen cloth, and with a never extinguished light before it, whilst on the altar itself, in accordance with Cistercian simplicity, stood a painted wooden crucifix.⁷ Before the former site of the high altar (for it has disappeared) is a broken knightly effigy of a descendant of the Fitzbardolph to whom the original foundation was due. But if the high altar is gone, it is a most interesting fact that one of the transept altars exists perfect,⁸ and there are two others of which the bases at any rate are not overthrown. A superb pavement of encaustic tiles formerly spread over the floor, as is testified by remaining fragments, and the various ascents to the altars remain *in situ*. The whole church measured 261 feet in length, or nearly 100 feet less than Rievaulx, though the width of its nave and aisles was 63 feet 8 inches, being 4 feet wider than those of the latter. Judging from the scanty fragments still undisturbed, and from the immense mass of richly moulded or sculptured stonework heaped round about the area of the church, it must have been a noble pile, in which a keen and innate sense of harmony and purity of form prevailed, the characteristic features of the period of architectural art in which it was erected, known to us as the Transitional Pointed.

As at Rievaulx, we find the cloister garth on the right hand of the church and as in this case it is orientated east and west, on the south side of the nave. To the east of the cloister are the exquisite remains of the chapter house, which happily exist to a far larger degree than any portion of the church.

⁶ See *English Minsters*, Walcott, *passim*.

⁷ *Life of St. Stephen*, Abbot. Dalgairns.

⁸ As so few pre-Reformation altars remain, it may be worth giving the following particulars of the one in question, carefully noted down on the spot. The date is probably *circa* 1156—1200. The altar is built up of four courses of dressed stones, and finished with a slab marked with five crosses. The greatest length of the *tabula* is 6 feet 4 inches, its width 3 feet 4 inches. The height from the *predella* is almost identical with that ordered by St. Charles Borromeo, viz., 3 feet 3¼ inches. There is a narrow void of 8 inches wide between the back of the altar and the wall. In the centre of the uppermost course of masonry and the lower surface of the *tabula* is a *loculus* for the relics.

Here again we find a *souvenir* of Clairvaux in the division by two rows of columns of this *domus capitularis* into three aisles. The shafts in question are slender monoliths of Nidderdale marble, the transport of which over the lofty ranges of hills which intervene must have involved no trifling labour. The raised step on which the monks sate in Chapter still shows through the soft thymey turf, and even yet upon the walls, though exposed to wind and rain for three centuries, traces of the original mural decorative colour may still be made out. A long row of half defaced, but yet speaking, tombstones of the abbots of the house lie humbly under foot, forming a portion of the pavement, and the names of Kyngeston, the first abbot, Sallay, and Snape may yet be deciphered through the green moss and lichen. After the church no place was of greater interest and importance in a Cistercian house than the chapter room. Daily, after Prime had been sung, the monks met within these walls, and before the whole community, each brother whose conscience reproached him with the slightest transgression of the rule, stepped forward, threw back his cowl, and cast himself prostrate on the pavement, and confessed his fault.⁹ Of the other apartments, the noble refectory, and the kitchen with its yawning fireplaces, are easily recognized, whilst in a small detached chapel, forming part of the abbot's lodgings, stands another altar but partially overthrown. A small portion of the "studious cloister" remains to the west, and the often quoted line is doubly applicable, for this was always devoted to the school of the novices. Above is a fragment of the wall of the dormitory which stood over the western alley.

We have seen how at Rievaulx the monks laboured amidst the stern woods and the narrow valley. Here, in the wide rich plain, they of Jervaulx had lowing herds and produced cheese, the type of what has come down to us in the "Wensleydale," dear to *gourmets* of to-day, and studs of horses which were renowned far and wide, as indeed is the breed of the district even now. Thus again we find the scope of the Rule fully realized here as elsewhere. At last came the hour of trial, the "decrees" of the tyrants of the sixteenth century were drawn up for the "unauthorized orders" with all the reckless injustice, and the flagrant hypocrisy, which we may see in the days in which we write. It is interesting to hear two witnesses, living in those evil days, speak, one as to the extreme beauty of the

⁹ *St. Stephen, Abbot. Dalgairns.*

yet undestroyed church, which he writes of as "one of the fairest churches that I have seen," and this was one of the commissioners of Henry the Eighth; and the other as to his recollection of the daily charity dealt to the poor at the Abbey Gate of Jervaulx, and that was "Old Jenkins," who lived to see the glory and the fall of this, and many another house of God during his long life of one hundred and sixty-nine years. In 1537 the last Abbot, Adam Sedburg,¹⁰ suffered on the gallows, the roof of the church was stripped of its lead, the abbey completely ruined, and the lands were leased to a creature of the kingly tyrant, and Jervaulx was known no more but as a wreck, and as a protest before God and man, against lust, greed, and heresy!

Such is a brief and imperfect sketch of two out of the eight Cistercian houses that existed in Yorkshire in the ages of faith, the others being Fountains, Byland, Sawley, Roche, Meaux, and Kirkstall. Eleven other houses of much less importance for nuns of the Rule of St. Bernard were scattered throughout the county. We will now turn to a less known yet most interesting monastic ruin, that of Mount Grace, one of the two Carthusian monasteries in Yorkshire.

If the Cistercian Rule was strict, that of the Carthusians was ascetic to the utmost degree. The most complete seclusion and solitude formed the basis of their constitutions. Each religious had his separate cell and garden, which they left only for the church, and none but the Prior and Procurator ever crossed the threshold of the limits of the monastery. Founded at the Grande Chartreuse, near Grenoble, by St. Bruno at the close of the eleventh century, the Order grew into sixteen or seventeen provinces, and counted in all some eighty-nine houses, some of which were of women. In 1181, only one year after St. Bruno's foundation, King Henry the Second brought the great St. Hugh of Lincoln from the Grande Chartreuse to found the first English house at Witham in Lincolnshire. But though the Order was well received, only nine of these "Charter-Houses," as they came to be called as a corruption of Chartreuse, were founded in our country. The well-known Charter House of London, Sheen known as the house of Jesus of Bethlehem, Henton in Somersetshire, called the *Atrium Dei*, and Mount Grace, of which we are about to write, appear to have been their chief foundations.

¹⁰ Lewis in his edition of Sanders calls him Sadler, vol. v. p. 138, n. 2.

It was in 1397 that Thomas Holland, the nephew and favourite of King Richard the Second—

Near to the King in blood and near in love—¹¹

founded Mount Grace. He had just been created Duke of Surrey, and in gratitude he desired that this house should be erected "for the good estate of the King and his Queen, to the glory of God, and for the affection we have to the Feast of the Assumption of the glorious Virgin Mary, and in honour of the Blessed St. Nicholas."¹² The buildings had not reached completion when the tragedy of Pontefract was enacted,

The Kings' blood had stain'd the King's own land,

and the Duke of Surrey, deprived of his title, and detected in a plot against the usurping Henry the Fourth, laid down his head upon the block, 1401. It was only some forty years later that Henry the Sixth confirmed the original grants, and that the building, which had all this time remained in an unfinished state, was completed. The widow of the founder, Surrey, had meanwhile in 1412, obtained permission to move her husband's mutilated remains from Cirencester, where he had been beheaded and buried, to the unfinished work of his pious foundation. As at Rievaulx, the tomb of the founder of Mount Grace is hidden amidst its ruins and unknown.

Coming over the hill from the neighbouring village of Osmotherley, our way lies downwards through a tangled wood, the shady footpath flecked with dancing lights and winding over knotted roots, amidst great drifts of blue bells. After a long descent, the wood ends in a great semicircular sweep, and nestling under the skirts of the leafy shelter, upon "the fresh green lap" of the edge of the great plain of York, lie, in the sunshine and the calm of solitude, all that remains of Mount Grace de Ingleby. A picturesque gabled farmhouse, dated 1654, and with the initials of the Lascelles, to whom the monastery and lands came some years after the Dissolution, gives access to the ruins. As was usual in Carthusian Houses, two great court-yards embrace the various buildings. We enter the smaller or southern court which was external to the inclosure. It is an irregular parallelogram, and embraces fragments of what were the residence of the prior, the guests' quarters, the great refectory which was only used on some rare occasions

¹¹ *Richard the Second*, Act iii. Scene 1.

¹² Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. p. 23.

during the year, the kitchen, and finally the monastic church. The excessive strictness of the Rule is reflected in the architecture of the Monasteries of the Chartreux; and even the church shows a minimum of architectural character, whilst its plan is peculiar and worthy of notice. It was a long aisleless structure, with a very short nave, a central tower, mere rudimentary transepts, and a choir. There seem to have been projecting side chapels to the choir as at Clermont,¹³ and the sacristy, the access to the church from the inner cloistered court, and possibly the sub-prior's apartments are to the north between the church and the boundary wall of the court-yards. Passing into the inner inclosure we find ourselves in a much larger area; all around are the doors and hatches of the fourteen cells, and, as is evident from the long range of corbels, a cloister, at one time, connected these cells with the church, and with each other. At any time, even when occupied by the silent recluses who here served God in such speechless solitude and prayer, this great green court with the steep wooded overhanging bank, and the blue sky above it, must have been solemn and striking. Now, quite desolate, the massive stone walls hemming you round, the tall church tower rising beyond them, roofless and ruined, with waving grasses and wild flowers growing in the crevices of the shattered masonry, it is a scene which leaves a deep impression on the mind. It is not altogether impossible by comparing one ruined cell with another to arrive at a fair idea of how the recluses were lodged. As we have said, a door from each cell gave access to the connecting cloister, but this door was only opened by its occupant when summoned for the Divine Office to the church, or on the rare occasions when the Brothers met in the refectory. Close by each door jamb, a square opening in the wall, which almost immediately turns at right angles, so that nothing can be seen either from the cloister or the cell, affords a means for conveying the scanty portion of daily food to the inmate. Within, the space was divided into an oratory and the kitchen or "living room" used for daily occupation with its fire-place. There was an upper room to each cell for sleeping. A small garden extended beyond to the high inclosure wall, which shut in the whole group of buildings.¹⁴ Doubtless, intelligent and carefully directed excavation, and clearing away of accu-

¹³ See Viollet le Duc, vol. i. p. 308, *Dict. d'arch.*

¹⁴ See *Dict. d'arch.* Viollet le Duc; and English Minsters, Walcott, *passim*.

mulated *debris* and soil, would lay open many points of interest in this unique ruin, and it is much to be hoped this will some day be done. Outside the priory walls, noble trees, probably planted by the monks, cast a pleasant shade here and there, whilst the green embankments of the former fish-ponds are still clearly to be traced. Nor was pure water wanting, for the hill-side provides copious springs, and one known as "St. John's Well," is still inclosed in its ancient stone arch.

Returning up the hill by another path through the trees, with picturesque bird's-eye views down into the monastery courtyards as we gradually ascend, where the trees fall off and the summit of the hill is bare and raised high above the plain, we reach, a most interesting relic—a chapel of our Blessed Lady, built when love for the Mother of God was warm and tender in old England. It is simple almost to rudeness, thoroughly in keeping with the stern architecture of the Carthusian Rule. A little cell¹⁵ for the chaplain of this pilgrimage, for such it was, formerly adjoined the chapel. Though built only as late as 1515, it is very probable there was an earlier structure on the same spot, and that the name "Mount Grace" had long been attached to the locality, where for centuries previous the faithful had invoked our Lady under the title *Mater Gratiae*. However that may have been, more than a century even after the last struggles for the old faith in Yorkshire, when gallant Robert Aske raised the standard of the Five Sacred Wounds, or later when old Richard Norton bore the same banner, the love for our Lady's Chapel at Mount Grace was still burning brightly. "Divers and sundrie superstitious and papistlie affected persons," risking fine and prison, found their way to this "chapel or hermitage, secretly and closely, and for the most part in the night-time, on the Lady's and other saints' eves."¹⁶ This was more than the ideas on religious liberty and freedom of conscience, as existing in the minds of Tobias Mathews, Archbishop, and John Thornebrough, Dean of York, could brook, and so in 1614 a writ was issued against these "superstitious" and "papistical" pilgrims, and save when a stray Catholic climbs the hill, or looks towards it from afar off, the devotion to our Lady of Mount Grace has been "stamped

¹⁵ The chapel and cell were granted to the last Prior, John Wilson, at the suppression. *Vide Dugdale's Monasticon*, vol. vi., p. 24.

¹⁶ *Notes and Queries*, December, 1861.

out." Gladly should we see this pious pilgrimage revived in these days of greater freedom of thought by our fellow Catholics, nor would there be any difficulty beyond the seven miles' walk from Northallerton, the nearest railway station. We venture to throw out this suggestion to the zealous clergy and faithful of Yorkshire. Our country needs prayers in the rising flood of infidelity, and beyond the claims of piety and devotion, the locality offers the deep interest of the ruins we have been describing, and a glorious view on the wide and fertile vale of York, which spreads out at the pilgrim's feet like a "steadfast sea," with the Venerable Minster of St. Peter of York standing dim in its midst, recalling that other St. Peter's, rising in its might and glory, afar across the wide Campagna.

GEORGE GOLDIE.

Passages from the Life of a Yorkshire Lady.

PART THE SECOND.

CHAPTER I.

"THE PAINTED LIFE."

NONE of Mary Ward's early biographies throw light on the circumstances which led to her sudden determination to return to England. Her own words also merely tell the fact and with what intention she went, in her own simple way, and reveal no more. In her *Italian Life*, written in 1627, she says: "At that time, with the consent of my confessor" (Father Roger Lee), "I made a vow to be a religious, but of no order in particular, not being inclined then to one or another, nor finding in any what I could desire. Afterwards, to obey him, without any inclination on my part, I also made a vow to enter the Order of St. Teresa if he should so command me. And afterwards, for good reasons, and with his permission I returned to England, with the intention of employing myself, by some means, in labouring for others." In the letter to the Nuncio Albergati already quoted,¹ she says: "I made a third vow, to spend some months in England to do all the little I could for God, and the good of those there, not to be idle in the meantime, and the better prepared for whatsoever God should call me to." Beyond these words, therefore, we are left to find some clue for ourselves, as to what had inwardly drawn her to take this step. Enough perhaps has been learned from Mary Ward's past history to answer the inquiry, and we shall find that of her whole life, and especially the facts of the next nine years, amply confirming the impression thus gained. It may well be imagined that her zeal for souls and for God's glory had neither expended itself nor evaporated, in the one successful effort which had founded the English Convent at Gravelines. But Mary had learned from Almighty God, that

¹ See above, Chapter XIII.

she did not even yet know how her life was to be spent for Him. In the last manifestation of His will to her, however, which had cost her so dearly, even the loss of the cloistered life she so greatly loved, there had been one word given to her, through which the rest still left in obscurity were to be unfolded to her. That word was "England," one already deeply engraven in her soul through all the prayers and sighs which she had poured forth to God, for we have seen how in all her previous undertaking, England and the English people were ever uppermost in her thoughts. Now, Almighty God had shown her that her future state of life was to be one "very much to God's honour, and the good of others, particularly England." No wonder then that that word was enough, and that the resolve was at once made to go to England, nor that she should go in confident hope that there God's further will would be manifested to her.

This resolution seems to have been entirely Mary's own. There is no reason to suppose that Father Roger Lee acted in the matter beyond giving his consent and encouragement to her proposition. Doubtless from his own early experience in similar doings before he was yet a religious, he must well have known the ample opportunities for helping souls which a fervent Catholic could find in the existing state of society in England, attended though it might be by imminent risk and danger. Mary, in the words which have been quoted above, does not mention that she had taken a vow of obedience to this Father, beyond that of entering some religious order, she only says that she had made a vow to go to England. The former vow is known, however by what she writes on many future occasions. The latter may have been sought by her, to give her strength for what nature shrank from, in "the loneliness and dangers of her now to be taken in hand encounters," which as Winefrid Wigmore has told us, weighed heavily upon her soul at times. That such a cloud was not suffered either to hinder Mary or to rest long upon her, the same writer proceeds to tell us, continuing, that, "knowing no further what part she was to act together with the mistrust of herself, (she) made a vow of obedience to her ghostly Father and to labour in England in the good of her neighbour, which latter guided by the former, she with great speed and inexpressible fervour put in execution, and therein passed a good space."

There is another testimony to this part of Mary Ward's history of an unusual kind, and as it will have to be frequently

brought forward, both with regard to her stay in England and on other occasions, it must be explained at greater length. Not many years ago, and within the memory of some of the present generation, there existed in the house of the English Institute of our Blessed Lady at Augsburg (founded by Mary Pointz, already mentioned as one of Mary Ward's first companions), a remarkable series of large old oil paintings, depicting many of the most striking events in Mary Ward's life. These pictures were no less than fifty in number, and are believed to have been in the house, together with many other ancient paintings, almost ever since the foundation, which dates from the year 1662, only seventeen years after Mary Ward's death. The tradition concerning them mentioned by one of Mary's biographers when writing about the year 1725, then was, that they were painted from the descriptions given to the artist by her first companions themselves. They are named as "the Painted Life," and as a decisive evidence on various points by one of the nuns of the Institute, to whom they were well known, and who assisted at that time to gather materials for the history. This nun will be again mentioned at a later period. The value of these paintings, therefore, resembles in some measure that of living testimony to the principal features of Mary Ward's life. This may perhaps be especially noted, as there will be occasion to remark at a future date, with regard to certain facts in the history of her interior life, which could only have been known from her own lips. That the series was painted in Germany appears likely, from the fact that each of them contained an inscription in old-fashioned German, describing the subject of the picture.

There is no evidence as to how these pictures were dispersed or destroyed. One of them is now in the Institute House at Bamberg. It is the first of this interesting series, and represents Mary when two or three years of age tottering across the room to her mother (who is standing with another lady on the opposite side), and is saved from a bad accident by saying the name of Jesus. Underneath are the words in ancient German, "Jesus was the first word of the infant Mary, after which she did not speak a word for many months." Among the documents in the archives of the Institute at Nymphenburg is a list, or rather a copy, also in old-fashioned German, of the inscriptions upon these paintings. The inscriptions contain many dates, not given by the author of Winefrid Wigmore's manuscript and

Mary's early biographers, who like many writers of that day do not always place events in their right chronological order, and almost wholly omit naming the year in which they occurred. We find from this copy that the pictures represented most of the events of Mary's childish years and girlhood, which have been already narrated. It is headed by the inscription on that at Bamberg, and the exact words are given which are at the bottom of that picture. Next follow Mary's dangerous fall and its cure, the fire at Mulwith, her first Communion, and the devil's attempt to hinder it. Then come in succession, Mary's first call to the religious state through Margaret Garrett, her desire for martyrdom, and what God thence revealed to her, the light and strength given her by reading the words, "Seek first the Kingdom of God," &c., her various suitors, including Neville, with her parents' and confessor's persuasions respecting him, and finally the spilt chalice and Father Holtby's words, followed by Mary's happy departure from England in 1606 to enter a convent at St. Omer. The veil is here drawn over the next three years of Mary's life, there is no attempt to delineate their sorrows and joys at St. Omer, or her successful residence at the Court of Brussels and its remarkable results, both to herself and to others respecting the new foundation.

The next and sixteenth painting of this series contained the following sentence: "Mary, in the year 1609, in the twenty-fourth year of her age, with the approval of her confessor whom she had vowed to obey in all things concerning her soul, made a vow to return to England to seek, conformably to her condition in life, for the salvation of souls: which she did, and with much fruit." She left St. Omer immediately after Easter and had settled a fixed period with Father Roger Lee, during which she was to remain in England. The movements of Catholics, especially if engaged in endeavouring to convert others, had to be very quietly and secretly set in hand, and very scanty information is to be found as to where Mary resided during these months. She appears to have been mostly with relations and intimate friends, and various indications show that this was not always in the same part of England, but that she was probably in Yorkshire and Gloucestershire and also in Suffolk.

Her love and duty to her parents would naturally, in returning to her native country, take her first to visit them, and Mary could do this with a free heart and easy conscience, for she could well say that God had sent her back whence she came.

It is much to be lamented that neither Mary Ward's biographers nor her own writings afford us more than a few words as to her father and mother, and most of the different members of her family with one exception only. She herself writes of them in narrating the history of her childhood and call to religion, but once having given up all that was dear to her for the love of God, her pen is occupied alone with what referred to the great work God gave her to do, and her own history and that of all belonging to her are told only in so far as that was affected by them. At this time her family were probably in Yorkshire. Barbara, her dearly-loved sister, little more than a year younger than herself, and of whom we shall hear at a future period, already drawn inwardly to the religious life, would doubly rejoice to see Mary again, as likely by her influence at home to remove the obstacles which stood in the way of her own vocation. Next younger to her came Mary's eldest brother, whose name appears to have been John, whom we have already heard of as the one "dearest to her of all her brothers and sisters, and most like, and sympathizing with her." It seems likely that he had married early in life, for in the list of recusants at Ripon made in 1604,² which has been quoted above, together with the wife of Marmaduke Ward, the name of "Janet, wife of John Ward," is entered. Elizabeth, Mary's youngest sister follows next in order, of whom there will also be some slight mention at a later date, and last and the youngest of the family, we find her brother George, born in 1594, and therefore at this time fifteen years of age, who eventually became a religious. Her mother was still living. Of her father, Marmaduke Ward, we hear nothing, nor indeed does his name again appear in any of Mary's writings, or in any manuscripts relative to her history. He appears to have left his daughter free to follow undisturbed the remarkable vocation to which God had called her.

CHAPTER II.

SOME SCENES IN THE STRAND IN 1609.

MARY's stay seems to have been the longest in London. We must remember that she was now living with the dress and manner of life of any other lady in her own rank. Her birth and position gave her access to the most distinguished society

² Peacock's *Yorkshire Catholics*, p. 43.

of the day to which Catholics were admitted, and her beauty and attractiveness made her eagerly sought for there. From Winefrid Wigmore we learn that she was "in lodgings" in London, "in St. Clement's Churchyard, in the Strand," but she does not name with whom she was living. These lodgings were situated in what was the most fashionable part of London in the seventeenth century. Somerset House was the dower Palace of Queen Anne of Denmark, who resided there at times, and the Strand and the streets leading to the river were full of the houses of the nobility and those about the Court, who sought to be near the Thames, then the great highway or Mall of London, along which the rich and noble floated in their pleasure barges, and gay processions were formed on festive or State occasions, in which royalty itself took part. But what attraction could there be in such a neighbourhood to one who had so lately rejected untasted all the splendour and festivity of the Court of Brussels? There was another side to the picture which will answer this question.

The years succeeding the Gunpowder Plot were part of the bitterest period of Catholic persecution. No Catholic's house was then safe, as we have seen, from rude and violent search. Catholics as they passed along in London were liable to be tracked by spies, and in a moment hurried off to give an account of their religion. Crowded prisons full of sufferers for the faith were but a few steps distant, and torture and death itself were at hand and of easy attainment. These streets, therefore, the very focus of gay and fashionable society, were for that reason least suspected, and in consequence freest from the visits of the pursuivants and their crew. It was here, and even in Protestant houses, that we find priests and others domiciled, engaged in the difficult and hazardous work of ministering to the souls of their fellow-Catholics, and endeavouring to stem the tide of heresy by rescuing those who had fallen into the snare. Mary was not, therefore, alone or solitary in this to her uncongenial neighbourhood, or in the occupations which kept her there, but was one among many not far distant, engaged in the same work. But what could a young and beautiful lady effect with an array of difficulties before her, which made even men's hearts shrink and fail them in the day of trial?

Our manuscript gives some information on this point, in a short general description of Mary's way of life and occupations during her present residence in England. "Still retaining [her

first] extreme beauty, she went clothed as became her birth for matter and manner, and wore underneath a most sharp hair-cloth, which by continuance did eat into her flesh ; nor did she omit her daily disciplines, oft fastings and much [very long] watching. When it was for the good of her neighbour, what did she reserve to herself? Neither honour, life, nor liberty. When it best suited with present occasions, she put on servants' and mean women's clothes. No prison did she dread to visit, or danger [to which she feared to expose herself] to pass, so as in some passages it was hard to say which virtue exceeded, her most innate modesty (which sometimes she was wont smilingly to say gave her trouble, she was so apt to blush) or courage had the upper hand, the one retiring her from all conversation, the other making her incapable of fears and apprehensions, or memory of her tenderness and beauty, or almost [one might say] her sex. As was visible in many occasions then and multitudes after, that God gave her an admirable power over wickedness in man or devil, and great protections in herself and by her to hers."

These few sentences open such a scene before us of love of souls, undaunted courage, firm faith, fearless forgetfulness, and, besides this, severe abnegation of self and confidence in and love of God, that the gentle timidity of character with which they were united but adds to their beauty. Can we wonder that marvellous results followed, or that the protection of God's good Providence should day by day shield Mary from harm while thus employed? But few details remain, alas! of a period so full of incident and interest as these six or seven months must have been, but what are told are evidently specimens only from a multitude such. They illustrate, however, in some measure, Winefrid Wigmore's words, and give us bright glimpses of Mary in her threefold life—in the world, at work for souls, and in secret with God.

Taking as our guide the order of events given in "the Painted Life," we find Mary, true to her inspirations, not lingering amidst the joys of a family reunion, but very shortly after her arrival, perhaps on her way to London, at the house of a family in Suffolk which, if not related to her by blood, was connected by marriage, and much bound up with her own by intimate friendship. This friendship, and the strong religious feelings amongst them, had induced them to unite in the unfortunate and mistaken projects terminating in the Gunpowder

Plot and its tragical results. Ambrose Rookwood, the conspirator, and Sir William Babthorpe, Mary's cousin and early friend, had married sisters. They were of the Lincolnshire family of Tyrwhitts. Mrs. Ambrose Rookwood possessed the same fervent spirit as many of the brave Catholic ladies of that time. As her husband passed by the window where she was standing, on his way to execution, he called out to her to pray for him. "I will," was her answer, "and be of good courage and offer thyself wholly to God. I for my part do as freely restore thee to God as He gave thee unto me." This faithful and courageous soul was perhaps at Coldham Hall when Mary went there in 1609, and would have found in her a congenial spirit. The Rookwoods were an ancient county family, and had some interest with James the First, as he, after a few years, knighted the conspirator's son. It does not appear that they suffered so greatly in fortune as most of the others concerned in the Plot; at any rate Coldham Hall seems to have been either left in their hands or restored to them after the execution of Ambrose.

While Mary was staying at this place the following incident occurred, which we will relate in Winefrid Wigmore's words: "A rich yeoman man's wife, [well known and] extraordinary well qualified for birth, and no less maliciously grounded in her heresy, so far as to put all that visited her out of hope of her conversion, whereof divers were very virtuous and learned priests, one day our dear Mother [hearing this] went to visit her in her wonted mild, sweet manner, shewed to her the feeling she had of her sickness, but more for her perverseness, putting her hand upon her head, said some few words to that effect, which made so strange and unexpected a change in her soul, as she cried out with great efficacy but serenity, 'I will be a Roman Catholic, and confess now, now;' which she did with so great exactness and light, with so hearty sorrow and feeling [and such manifest signs of a true repentance], as amazed the confessor." The writer of our manuscript places this occurrence, among others, at one of Mary's later visits to England, but in the series of paintings it ranks as the first event recorded in 1609, the inscription on the seventeenth of them running thus: "Mary at Coldham Hall in England, by the touch of her hands and by friendly conversation so changed a very wealthy matron, who was quite hardened in heresy (and of which conversion learned and spiritual men, after many strenuous labours

and exhortations, had despaired), that she called out, 'I will be a Catholic, confess my sins, and do all which belongs to a perfect conversion,' which, with great fervour, she afterwards accomplished." We shall hereafter find that this was not the only soul whom Mary won for Almighty God while staying with the Rookwood family, and that she gained a still richer prize which brought great fruit to Him in after days.

In the next painting of the historical series, Mary was depicted as in London, making use of the knowledge which her relationship gave her of the state of various souls to become the instrument of good to them. Miss Gray is named as her aunt, though with more likelihood she should have been called her cousin. How they were related has not elsewhere been found. Mary must have been aware, perhaps by some words she may have let fall in ordinary conversation, that Miss Gray's mind was open to conviction as to the Catholic faith, but that her knowledge was imperfect; she saw probably that her understanding was at fault, not her heart. Relations are rarely the direct human agents in the conversion of others, especially if the one in error is the elder of the two. They are generally the last who have any power to speak on the all but forbidden subject. There is perhaps a chord in the heart of the wanderer which can be touched, but another hand must strike it; it may be the long, silent prayers of years which win the victory at last, yet strange lips finally bring home the long-veiled truth. But Mary had no one to whom she could intrust the delicate and difficult commission. Was this soul then to perish?

From the inscriptions on two of the ancient pictures we find what followed. The eighteenth has these words: "Mary, urged by an ardent zeal and longing for souls, in order to lead her aunt, Miss Gray, to the Catholic religion, when in London put on, instead of her own handsome lady's dress, the clothes of her waiting-maid, that she might thus be able unrecognized to speak freely with her aunt in a house appointed for the purpose." Almighty God prospered the venturesome attempt and the loving zeal which suggested it, for the next painting contained the following sentence: "Mary when in London, through her fervent prayers and conversation, persuaded her aunt, Miss Gray, to treat there with a priest of the Society of Jesus, concerning her reception of the true faith, and not without fruit." The priest here mentioned may have been Father Holtby, who was still Superior of the English Mission, in

which office he continued until the present year, and who as such would live principally in London. We cannot doubt that Mary would be in communication with him. There is a manuscript letter existing of Father Holtby's¹ signed under the *alias* North, which he frequently used, addressed to Mr. Roger Lee. It is upon the affairs of the Society of Jesus, under the disguised names of "Journeymen," "Customer," &c. He says towards the end as if in answer to a letter of Father Lee's, "I will not be unmindful of anything that concerneth my daughter Ward's good." This letter is without date, except "Sep. 17," but probably may be referred to the present period.

Neither the conversion of her aunt or cousin by Mary, nor that which was also represented in the nineteenth picture of "the Painted Life" is mentioned in Winefrid Wigmore's manuscript. This picture contained two subjects, Miss Gray's interview with the Father of the Society of Jesus had apparently taken place, for safety's sake, in the house where a Protestant had resided, no uncommon precaution where it could be effected. This scene was interwoven on the canvas with another, in which, through Mary's means, the deathbed repentance and conversion of the Protestant lady is delineated. The second part of the nineteenth inscription thus describes it: (Mary) "also there convinced an obstinate heretic on her deathbed, so that she returned to the one saving faith and received the Holy Viaticum with devotion." This conversion is mentioned in the manuscript *Life of Mary*, by Father Lohner, who does not name the others.

CHAPTER III.

THE DISAPPOINTED NOBLEMAN.

These short histories leave ample room to imagine how Mary's days were spent in London. The success with which God rewarded her daring attempts, but urged her on to further enterprizes, and gave her greater confidence in Him. No detail is given by her biographers as to the number of souls whom she benefited, but from their expressions it was very considerable. Father Dominic Bissel, in his biography of Mary, says of this visit to England: "She led back into the fold of the Catholic Church, not a few of those who had wandered from the path of the true faith. Among a number of others were two ministers,

¹ P.R.O., *Dom. James I.* vol. 188,

or so-called preachers, who afterwards exhorted others also of their companions to forsake the Calvinistic heresy, which in like manner was happily accomplished." The history of these two ministers shows her not to have been deficient in knowledge how fittingly to answer the arguments used by Protestant divines of those days, though it may be that her prayers and her holiness of life made as many conversions as her powers of controversy. Her courage and perseverance were indomitable. Vincentio Pageti says in his *Breve Racconto*: "She laboured day and night in seeking to gain lost souls, despising danger either to life or honour, for she was accustomed to say that 'God is not wanting to good wills, and that it gives Him pleasure that we should trust Him, when He gives us light to know that He trusts us.'" Winefrid Wigmore adds: "Divers were withdrawn from libertine lives, others put out of occasions, and many that desired to be religious, and had not the means, were holpen and disposed so as they attained the effects. She assisted so many towards their being religious, as herself did not so much as know the persons when by occasion of seeing her they acknowledged the grace of being religious to have come by her means."

It must always be kept in mind that Mary, while engaged in these bold and dangerous undertakings to gain access and bring help to souls, had not withdrawn herself from ordinary secular life, and the society to which her birth and family connections gave her entrance. It was by means of mixing in a certain measure with the world around her that she hoped to draw souls away from it to God, and for this reason she returned to what she once thought she had renounced for ever, uncongenial as all she found there must have been to her. The recovery of one soul which had wandered far from God, and of whom she probably heard indirectly, from some frequenter of the gay and dissipated coteries of the day whom she came across, was alone a rich reward, had there been no other. But from Winefrid Wigmore's words, the case was not a solitary one. Her manuscript thus informs us: "Amongst others that were reduced from bad life one was as famous for her birth as enormous for her crime. This party would say she had as a bewitching power to draw one from oneself, and put them where she would and they ought to be."

This "bewitching power" which Mary possessed over the hearts of others sometimes brought disagreeable and certainly unlooked for results to herself. One of these, and doubtless

there were others such, formed the twentieth subject of the Painted series of pictures. Mary had most likely been in society, joining some circle of friends, with the one object to which she had devoted herself before her eyes, and, while engrossed herself with this, giving pleasure to others, and charming them with the affability and sweetness for which she was so remarkable. Strangers, and probably Protestants among them, were present. Towards evening she returned to her lodgings, but had not long arrived when well-dressed men servants came to the door, bringing with them from their master what the inscription on the painting names as "an elegant collation." Another of Mary's early biographers mentions it as "sweetmeats or confectionery." This was sent by some nobleman, and intended as a complimentary gift, for the purpose evidently, according to the fashion of the time, of ingratiating himself with Mary. His efforts had but poor success, however. The inscription tells us how they were received. It runs as follows: "While in London, an elegant collation was sent to Mary from a person of rank, by his servants, but she fearing, and not unjustly, that a snare of the wicked enemy might be hidden underneath, bolted herself into her room, and passed the whole night in prayer and works of penance." The fine collation apparently went back, unlooked at even, to its owner.

And now, amidst such scenes of outward toil and activity, and even of adventure, as we may call them, attended by perhaps as dangerous an excitement, the power of attracting others by her own charms, and drawing to herself the love and admiration of all those she met with, we are admitted to one sight of Mary's interior life. Nor shall we be disappointed. It is the one event which she describes herself of all her London experiences, plainly from its importance as touching upon the very object for which she had come to England. She is writing in her Italian life, for those who are to judge of the truth of her vocation, and she therefore has to give some account, first of all, of how she fulfilled the vow she had offered to Almighty God of labouring in England for the souls of others. This she does truthfully, but in as few and general words as possible, passing over every detail which would have told to her own honour. After stating her return to England, she goes on: "And as far as I may judge, I did not spend that time ill, nor was I negligent in doing as far as it was possible to me that for which I went, nor were my few labours altogether in vain,

divers now living holily in various religious orders say that they left the world in great part by means of my conversation. Various other good things happened then, which it appears better to omit, because I do not know how to explain myself without so many words, and those so unapt. The following, nevertheless, I ought not to leave out.

"One morning, making my meditation coldly, and not at all to my satisfaction, at the end of it I resolved to assist a person to be accepted in some convent who much desired to become a nun, but, wanting a portion, could not otherwise enter one; and then going to dress myself according to the fashion of the country and other circumstances, whilst I adorned my head at the mirror, something very supernatural befell me, similar to that already related on the day of St. Athanasius, but more singular, and, as it appears to me, with greater impetuosity, if greater there could be. I was abstracted from out of my whole being, and it was shown to me with clearness and inexpressible certainty that I was not to be of the Order of St. Teresa, but that some other thing was determined for me, without all comparison more to the glory of God than my entrance into that holy religion would be. I did not see what the assured good thing would be, but the glory to God which was to come through it, showed itself inexplicably and so abundantly as to fill my soul in such a way that I remained for a good space without feeling or hearing anything but the sound, 'Glory, Glory, Glory.' By accident I was then alone, therefore what external changes this and similar things cause I cannot say, but from the internal feeling and bodily disturbance they must be remarkable; my knowledge fails as to their continuance; all appears to last but a moment, even at those times when afterwards I made a computation of time, and found it to have been about two hours.

"On this occasion a good space of time passed before I recovered, but, returned to myself, and finding my heart full of love for this thing, accompanied by such glory that not yet can I comprehend what it was, and seeing for certain that I was not to be of the Order of St. Teresa, remembering also the vow which I had made of being of that Order if my confessor should command me, I felt great fear of offending God in these two contraries, or of adhering to one or the other side; to resist that which now had been operated in me I could not, and to have a will in opposition to the vow I ought not. In this conflict,

giving myself to prayer, I protested to God, so liberal, that I had not and would not admit on this occasion any other will than His, and, as a testimony and sign that my mind and will were totally to do His without exception, I put on a hair-cloth, which I have forgotten for how long a time I wore, but I believe for some continuance, for I well recollect that through this and other corporal penitences, done for this end during the months that I remained in England, I did no little injury to my health, especially being occupied at that time with some fervour in winning and aiding others, observing (according to my knowledge) the circumstances requisite and suitable to the said business and to my condition. An office but too honourable, but nevertheless painful enough, if not undertaken for Him to Whom we owe all, and through the help of Whose grace alone it is fitly and perseveringly feasible."

The author of Winefrid Wigmore's manuscript places the above occurrence in one of Mary's later residences in England, but her own words are sufficiently explicit to show that it happened during the eventful visit of 1609. The "Painted Life" confirms this, for the twenty-first inscription states: "When Mary was in London in the year 1609, after a meditation, which she did not perform as she thought with sufficient fervour, while she was dressing, and purposing, in compensation for this fault, to give the necessary dowry to a lady who had a desire to be a religious, but through failure of means could not put it into effect, she fell into an ecstasy, in which she was deprived of the use of all her senses and movements, and clearly recognized that it was not the Divine will that she should enter a severe order, but that she was called to a far more excellent state, which would without comparison better advance the glory of God. Which glory so absorbed her soul that, after the lapse of two hours, which appeared to her to be a quarter of an hour, she could hear nothing for a long time but this word glory, which rang continually in her ears." The writer of the inscription has not quoted Mary's words correctly. She does not say that she saw that the state she was called to was one which would promote God's glory to a greater degree than a severe order, but that she herself personally, by embracing some state still to be shown to her, would advance the Divine honour far more than she could by entering the Teresian Order. To that Order, moreover, she never had been drawn interiorly; it was in obedience only that she would have entered it, for the

Order of the Poor Clares had already completely satisfied all her desires as to an ascetic life.

Winefrid Wigmore's account contains one or two additional details, and as they must have been received from Mary Ward herself, it is given here likewise. "Once, after her morning prayer, combing of her head, she was surprised with something above her own forces, and intellectually saw a glory to redound to God so great and so inexpressible, as the more she saw the less she found the end. It took away the sight of her corporal eyes, and in her ears sounded nothing but Glory! Glory! Glory! and this impression and sound in her ears lasted many days. This happened to her in lodgings in St. Clement's Churchyard, in the Strand, in London." The French manuscript edition adds explanatorily: "In the great street which goes from Somerset Palace to the King's Palace."

Catholic Review.

I.—REVIEWS.

1. *The Anglican Ministry; its nature and value in relation to the Catholic Priesthood.* An Essay by Arthur Wollaston Hutton, M.A., of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.

PROTESTANTISM is the mental attitude of men who protest against whatever is supernatural in religion. There are shades of Protestantism, deeper or lighter, according as the supernatural is more or less excluded. But, in mathematical phrase, Protestantism in the limit coincides with the utter rejection of the supernatural. A man is supernaturally endowed according as he is made in the likeness of the Word made Flesh. This likeness may be either individual or official. The individual likeness consists in being a Christian, clothed in supernatural habits of faith, hope, and charity.* *Christianus alter Christus*. The official likeness consists in being marked out as Christ's deputy to do His work amongst men. This is the Christian priesthood. The priest is the Lord's Anointed, *Christus Domini*—like the Master Whom he serves. The work of Christ was to sacrifice Himself for sinners, and to dispense forgiveness of sins. To offer Christ in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to forgive sins in the Sacrament of Penance, is the supernatural work of the Christian priest. The Protestant will have none of this supernatural work. He scoffs at the Sacrament of Penance, and calls the Mass a "blasphemous fable." He leaves the Christian priest no more than the functions of a priest in mere natural religion, namely, to read prayers for the people, and preach sermons.

He hears the parson preach and pray.

The parson preaches and prays, and gives his people bread and wine in memory of the death of Christ. Such is the Anglican Ministry, as Cranmer and Parker intended it, and as the people of England for three hundred and thirty years have

commonly considered it. The idea of a parson saying Mass or hearing confessions is to an average English mind simply ludicrous. The mention of it would have thrown Samuel Johnson into a passion. "Why, sir," he would have cried, "if you want that sort of thing, you must go to Rome for it." The Bishops of the Establishment in their Charges say so to this day.

But a wonder has happened in the English Church. A number of her ministers claim all the supernatural powers of a Roman Catholic priest, along with a far freer exercise of them than he has. They base this claim on history, on ritual, and on the principles of Roman theology. Father Hutton's book is an examination of this claim. He does it ample justice, and enters with the kindliness of a former associate into the feelings and motives of those who put it forth. At the same time he cannot allow the claim. He finds an amount of evidence against it that is legally overwhelming.

It may be that the Anglican rite of ordination from 1552 to 1662 was of itself invalid. It may be that Anglican bishops have not, or had not, any sufficient intention to give the Sacrament of Orders. But neither of these two probabilities taken separately makes the main argument against the validity of Anglican ordination. That argument is formed by the combination of the two, and it is this, that the Anglican rites for Ordination and for Communion are the outcome of older rites altered, and altered with a clear heretical intention of getting rid of the Sacrifice of the Mass: such alterations vitiate the rite, as being the outward avowal of an intention that renders the rite nugatory.

Let us suppose that the devisers of the Edwardine Ordinal had been not altogether the shameless and irreverent men that they were; and that while disbelieving in the Mass, they had been so far overcome by the beauty of the old Sarum Pontifical as to copy thence in full the Ordination Service, as a precious piece of antiquity, to adorn their Reformed Church. Cranmer actually did continue to use this service during the years of schism under Henry the Eighth, from 1534 to 1547, without alteration. His royal master might have cut his head off, if he had ventured to alter anything. Had Anglican Orders come down without break from Cranmer, and had the ancient Ordinal been maintained, Anglican clergymen might then be acknowledged bishops and priests in the Catholic sense, notwithstanding

that their line of succession runs through Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Bancroft, and Abbot, men who assuredly hated holy Mass and the Sacrament of Penance, and had no explicit intention to propagate either. The case supposed would be parallel to that of a Calvinist baptism or an ordinary Protestant marriage. The Protestant bride and bridegroom have no thought of mutually administering and receiving a sacrament: the Calvinist minister loathes the doctrine of baptismal regeneration: yet inasmuch as the Protestant couple, being baptized, have a predominant wish to be lawfully married, and inasmuch as the Calvinist minister uses the right form of baptism, intending it to do all the good it can, slight as he believes that good to be, a sacrament is conferred in both cases, for all the heretical notions of the ministers.

A sacrament is defined to be a *working sign of grace*. A sacrament gives the grace which it signifies: it is efficacious so far as it is significant. While the sign remains, the sacrament remains. Consequently it is not easy—I do not say it is impossible, but it is not easy—for a sacrament to be rendered null and void by a mere internal act of the minister, an act which receives no mode or manner of expression whether in the sacramental rite itself or in the adjuncts of that rite. But if the intention to defeat the sacrament finds outward expression, as if a Calvinist should baptize with the form, *I baptize thee, but I do not regenerate thee*, the sacrament is lost, inasmuch as its significance is destroyed. In this way, even though Matthew Parker were as good a bishop as St. Augustine, the ordination which he gave was invalid: for all the adjuncts of that ceremony, and notably the wilful perversion and maiming of the ancient Ordinal and Communion Service, cried aloud, *The candidate is ordained, a priest if you please, but not a sacrificing priest*. The alteration of the form in a heretical sense, as Canon Estcourt points it out, and after him Father Hutton, seems to us the killing indictment against Anglican Orders.

The form of ordaining a priest according to the Anglican rite for the century before the revision of 1662, ran as follows: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacraments." If this form had been the use of some schismatical communion, among whom the Sacrifice of the Mass was publicly acknowledged, confession of sins practised, and

absolution commonly given: so that the fact was patent and manifest to all beholders, that these words were intended to bestow the power of offering the Lamb of God in sacrifice and of absolving from sin: then there would be a fair probability of the form in question being sufficient and valid for the making of a Mass-priest. But how exactly the reverse of all this was the state of things in the first century of the Anglican Establishment! To discover the true meaning of a proposition, we must consider, not the bare words, but the look and gesture of the speaker. Words vary in meaning according to the external circumstances which are made to accompany them. The like is true of sacramental forms. A form of Orders that would be valid in Abyssinia, might have been invalid in the England of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

For a thousand years Catholic priests in the Latin Church have been ordained by the imposition of hands with prayer, and by the delivery of chalice and paten. As this latter ceremony, called the "tradition of instruments," forms no part of the Anglican rite, Catholics used to argue that the rite was plainly invalid by reason of that omission: for the more common opinion of medieval theologians placed the essence of the Sacrament of Order in the tradition of instruments. But the Greeks, whose Orders are recognized at Rome, have no such ceremony; and as Morinus pointed out in 1655, the tradition of instruments was not practised in the Western Church till about the ninth century. The argument from this omission appears thus to fall to the ground. Not altogether so, however. The argument may still be sustained in two ways. First, there is grave reason to think that the tradition of instruments is, and has been for some hundreds of years, essential to the validity of an ordination in the Western Church. For, say the advocates of this opinion, Christ did not institute the Sacrament of Order in detail: He commanded only the imposition of hands, with suitable words and ceremonies to indicate the office that was being conferred: these words and ceremonies are left to the determination of the Church.

Now, these reasoners go on to urge, the Latin Church, centuries before the Reformation, had determined upon the rite of the tradition of instruments, and most of her doctors regarded that rite as essential to the sacrament; nay (speaking of an ordination in the Western Church), many do still believe it essential. Therefore, they argue, by the Church's determina-

tion, the tradition of instruments is essential to a valid ordination in the Western Church, and was essential already in the sixteenth century. Consequently, in omitting it, the framers of the Edwardine Ordinal mutilated the sacrament in an essential particular. Anglican clergymen, then, to this day are not priests, because the instruments of sacrifice have never been officially delivered to them, or to their fathers in the ministry.

Father Hutton is favourable to this line of argument. To us also the argument, and the theological opinion on which it is founded, appears solidly probable. But it is by no means the main argument against Anglican Orders. The main argument, as I said before, is this, that in the Edwardine Ordinal the rite is altered to express a heretical intention, the intention, namely, of denying and withholding the power to say Mass. This comes out most clearly by the omission of the tradition of instruments, and of the accompanying words, which were in the Sarum rite as they are in the Roman: *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini*—i.e., "Take thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses for the living and for the dead, in the Name of the Lord." Why did Cranmer and his co-revisors leave these words out, unless it were that in the very hour of ordination they wished to protest to all who were mindful of the old ways, that the ministry conferred by their hands henceforth was not to be the ministry of the new and eternal Testament in the Blood of Christ? To me it is probable that this omission of the tradition of instruments and accompanying words, this eloquent silence breathing heresy, was sufficient of itself wholly to vitiate and nullify the Edwardine "Form of Ordering Priests," in the mouths of men like Cranmer and Parker.

Father Hutton is "disposed to hold that at the present day the most *effective* argument for Catholics to urge against all defenders of the Anglican Episcopal succession, would be the dependence of all Anglican Orders on Barlow, and the probability that he was never a Bishop."¹ This is the most *effective* argument for people who will not look at theology; but the most *weighty* argument, in our judgment, is got from the theological consideration of the nullity of a sacramental form when altered in a heretical sense.

There is a document printed by Burnet at the end of his

¹ P. 397, note.

history, which goes to confirm the likelihood, urged so strongly by Canon Estcourt and Father Hutton, that Barlow deliberately avoided ever being consecrated bishop. In 1540 Cranmer put a number of questions about the sacraments to about a score of English Bishops and Doctors, and received written answers from them. Question 12 is likely to have tried the feelings of the then prelate of St. David's, William Barlow. It was: "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only the appointing to the office be sufficient." Cranmer himself, who should have consecrated Barlow, gave this reply:

In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop, needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereunto is sufficient.

The answers of the rest are thus summarized in the document:

The Bishop of St. David saith, that *only the appointing*. Dr. Coxe,² that *only appointing*, "*cum manuum impositione*," is *sufficient without consecration*. The Archbishop of York, London, Duresme, Carlile, Drs. Daie, Curren, Lughton, Tresham, Edgworth, Oglethorpe, say that *consecration is requisite*. Dr. Redmayne saith, that *consecration hath been received since the Apostles' time, and instituted of the Holy Ghost to confer grace*. My lord of Rochester, Dr. Daie, and Symons, say, that *priesthood is given* "*per manuum impositionem*," and that *by Scripture; and that consecration hath of long time been received in the Church*.

The Bishop of St. David's here gives just the answer that might have been looked for from his unhallowed lordship.

The main line of Father Hutton's argument, as we see it, runs thus:

1. Diligent inquiry has failed to find any record of Barlow's consecration; rather there have been found considerable indications of the omission of that rite in his case.

2. It had better be acknowledged that the account in the Lambeth Register of Parker's consecration by Barlow, Dec. 17, 1559, is in the main correct.

3. The rite used on that occasion, and the Anglican rites of ordination generally, are invalid, owing to the abhorrence of the Catholic priesthood by those who used them, especially from 1559 to 1662, an abhorrence which they took care clearly to signify by the rites which they remodelled for that purpose.

² Made by Elizabeth Bishop of Ely. The "proud prelate," whom she threatened to "unfrock."

If the Anglican claims ever came to be juridically examined at Rome, some person would be appointed to bring forward all that could be said in favour of the Orders of the Church of England. There are two arguments which such a *promoter* would be blind to neglect. Both arguments are fairly dealt with by Father Hutton. The first argument he states thus :

Remember that from the very first the Anglican bishop, in ordaining a priest, has laid his hands upon him, and to the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost," has added the words, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Is there not here recognized a true sacerdotal function, such as defines and fixes the intention with which the Anglican form is used? And if the Bishop's intention is directed to the ordaining of an absolving priest, must he not at the same time ordain a sacrificing priest, a true *sacerdotem* in every sense, though he uses no words to express this other priestly function? For who ever heard of a priest who had received power to absolve, but not to say Mass?

Father Hutton recognizes the subtlety and plausibility of this argument. To my mind, it is about the best thing that can be said for Anglican Orders. But, as Father Hutton well observes, the bishops whose intention is mainly in question, are the earliest Anglican prelates. Did Grindal, Jewel, Cox, or Pilkington, intend to ordain absolving priests any more than sacrificing priests? Let alone their private intention: did not their public episcopal (or unepiscopal) behaviour, and the discipline (or disorder) of the Establishment which they served, proclaim to the world that they meant the Sacrament of Penance to go the way of abolition with the Sacrifice of the Mass? The absolution of a priest, not being strictly a parish priest, is invalid, except he receive jurisdiction and approbation, or "faculties," from the Ordinary. Is there any record of a grant of "faculties" by any Elizabethan bishop, or by any Anglican prelate whatsoever—even Archbishop Tait or Bishop Temple? "Now," says Father Hutton—

The total absence of any such discipline as this in the Anglican Church at once arouses a suspicion that the Reformers did not retain the words, "Whose sins thou shalt forgive," &c., in their obvious and Catholic sense. Such a discipline had existed in the Catholic Church of England till the days of Cranmer, but it totally disappeared with the advent of the Anglican system. Are we then to suppose that the Reformers intended to ordain absolving priests, and at the same time to free them from the trammels of the old disciplinary regulations? So

preposterous a view of the action of men who rejected Penance from among the Sacraments of the Gospel, and condemned it as a "corrupt following of the Apostles," cannot possibly be maintained. Yet if this was not their aim, we can only conclude that they knew full well that the men ordained with this form would make no pretence to have received a sacramental commission to absolve.

Any one who wishes for instances of grants of "faculties" in the *unreformed* English Church may be referred to the *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense*, Rolls Series.

The second argument touches the historical side of the question. Barlow, in consecrating Parker, was assisted by three others, one of whom, Hodgkins, was indisputably a bishop. All four imposed hands on Parker, with the words, "Take the Holy Ghost." Though Barlow acted as principal consecrator, it is contended that the cooperation of Hodgkins was enough to confer the sacrament, even though Barlow himself were no bishop. All that need be said in reply is, that as the mind of the Suffragan of Bedford on that occasion is wholly unknown, we can but suppose that he had no intention of acting otherwise than as the two assistant bishops at a Catholic consecration act. Now, the action of such assistants is indeed a true cooperation,³ but, according to almost all theologians (Father Hutton finds but one timid dissentient, Hallier), the cooperation of the assistants is not such as would validate the rite if it were invalid on the part of the principal consecrator. In a question of the validity of a sacrament we must be guided by the opinions of theologians, as we should be guided by the opinions of lawyers as to the validity of a will.

Father Hutton illustrates the position by the following imaginary case.

Archbishop A, attended by his chaplains E and F, is travelling to meet two other bishops, B and C, personally unknown to him, in conjunction with whom he is to consecrate D, a priest, to the Episcopate. On the way he is taken ill; and his chaplains, unfortunately not the best of men, . . . leave his Grace to recover as best he may; and E, who is familiar with Pontifical functions, undertakes to personate his master, F witnessing to his identity. They meet B and C, and E, assisted by them, professes to consecrate D, all the details of the rite being duly observed, the two real bishops therefore imposing their hands, and saying with E, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. What would

³ Father Hutton likens it to the cooperation of Aaron and Hur with Moses, and to the cooperation of Mary in the Redemption.

theologians say as to the validity of such a consecration? It is conceivable that one or two might urge that D should be consecrated afresh *sub conditione*, to avoid any possibility of sacrilegious iteration, but the vast majority would surely affirm the nullity of the act, and would demand unconditional consecration.

We would draw attention to the pages in which Father Hutton disposes of what is perhaps the main support of the belief in Anglican Orders—the stately bearing of the English Establishment and the splendour of Ritualistic celebrations. State and splendour do not necessarily mean a true priesthood. There was much that was magnificent and sublime in the worship of Apollo, especially in the revival under Julian.

There is one thing vastly more important than valid Orders, that is, membership with the true Church. Better a Catholic layman than a schismatic priest. Again and again should this consideration be pressed upon an Anglican claimant of sacerdotal powers. In the words of Father Hutton :

Hardly one of the early heresies and schisms lacked true bishops and priests. . . . The question then may fairly be asked : “To what purpose do you maintain the validity of your Orders, when, even if that be allowed, you cannot prove that you are within the Church.

JOSEPH RICKABY.

2. *Conférences d'Angleterre*. Par Ernest Renan, de l'Académie Française. Paris, 1880.

M. Ernest Renan has thought it right to commit to print the Hibbert Lectures which he was this year privileged to deliver ; and those who had not the advantage of hearing his addresses in St. George's Hall, can now study them leisurely at home. In the Preface which he has prefixed to his work, he congratulates himself that his words were received with applause by that “strong, bold nation”—he means the English—“which has always inspired him with the greatest esteem and the highest sympathy,” and amongst which he counts many friends “whose hands he had been a long time desiring to shake.” We have no desire to subtract in the least from the unction which M. Renan lays to his soul. That he addressed very crowded audiences in St. George's Hall, trustworthy newspaper reports testify ; that he was invited to deliver a lecture at the Royal Institution is beyond question ; and that he acquitted

himself of his task on these several occasions in the manner which is peculiar to all that he has hitherto spoken or written, will be clear to every one who chooses to waste an hour over the volume before us. That M. Renan is neither better nor worse than usual is assuredly no ground of complaint against him; of this we do not complain, and in this we find no matter for surprise. But that M. Renan, at his usual level, should have succeeded in drawing together crowds of what we must presume to be the enlightened members of English society, to listen to his words and to applaud them, is a circumstance for which it is worth while to seek an explanation. The curiosity natural to Englishmen will, doubtless, go far to explain this seeming wonder. Any imported novelty is certain to attract attention amongst them. They will pay their money, and endure uncomplainingly the inconveniences of a crowded hall, to see and hear a champion swimmer, a Spanish bull-fighter, or a dubiously African Zulu. Their passion of curiosity is easily roused; even M. Renan's presence was enough to excite it. Besides, M. Renan had come to them in the name of science, and there is a large section of the English people who pride themselves upon being patrons of science, and having a becoming respect for scientific men. Now M. Renan's science is of that easy kind which is not above the level of men who are rich enough to patronize science without being learned enough to understand it. In fact, a long time has elapsed since thoughtful Frenchmen ceased to recognize in M. Renan a deep thinker or an accurate scholar, and it will have been a pleasant surprise to him to receive from cultured audiences the homage rendered to a man of approved scientific acquirements. When M. Renan published his *Vie de Jésus*, an eminent French scholar¹ pointed with indignation to the work as a reproach to the scientific character of France, and a wanton insult to the intelligence of Frenchmen, and deplored the accident which must give to the schools of Germany and England the opportunity of scoffing at the standard of criticism prevalent in France.

"Writing for Frenchmen, he must have believed that the intellectual capacity of his readers did not rise above the level of romance. Of what use would be a serious discussion, where all that was needed was to spread a little varnish of poetry over some scraps of exegesis picked up here and there in the German schools? In other places people would laugh at this; in France

¹ M. l'Abbé Freppel, now Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers.

it would secure success. Well, I begin by saying that this easy contempt for the intelligence of the French reading public wounds me to the heart: I am of opinion that we have not deserved the insult. I do not know whether M. Renan's book will succeed in rousing indignation; but for my part I feel myself humbled and pained by it—pained, for the honour of French science, which will be held up to ridicule abroad;—humbled, for the foremost of our learned bodies, which counts among its members the writer who has just given to the world such a proof of frivolousness. I make the plain avowal that one of the things which has been most present to my mind in the perusal of this jocose narrative is the thought that it may occur to some German or English critic to accept this dissertation as a measure of the value of French research."

It may be permitted us to doubt whether the writer of these words justly appreciated the critical acumen of the public which in England decides upon the merits of scientific men and scientific theories. "Science," said M. Renan, in the discourse pronounced at his admission to the Academy, "gives happiness when we are content with it"—*La science donne le bonheur quand on se contente d'elle*. It might, perhaps, be objected to the aphorism that it would be equally true were the word "science" replaced by any other substantive in the language. At any rate, it is so very true that it covers the case of those who can be happy on a little science. There are many critics in England who content themselves with a little science, and find, accordingly, their happiness therein, and it was, we must suppose, into the hands of these easy judges M. Renan had fallen when his words were received with applause.

We have no intention of dealing seriously with M. Renan's utterances. According to his own estimate of them, they can be but guesses at truth. "There is only one thing certain," he holds; "it is the paternal smile which, at certain hours, passes over nature, bearing witness that an eye is watching us and a heart is following us"—*Une seule chose est certaine, c'est le sourire paternel, qui, à certaines heures, traverse la nature, attestant qu'un œil nous regarde et qu'un cœur nous suit*.² Under these circumstances, it would be superfluous to determine the historic value of M. Renan's statements.

He sets himself the task of tracing the rise of Rome to its present pre-eminence in the Christian system. He finds that

² *Conférences*, p. 201.

the religion of ancient Rome prepared the Romans for the part they were to play in the Christian order. He then describes the introduction of Christianity into the city, and takes the opportunity graphically to describe the entrance of the first preacher of the Gospel into the capital of the empire. It will be interesting to the students of ecclesiastical history to know that the first Christian missionary spent the night of his arrival at the City fort, on a bed of straw. No detail of the incident has been hidden from M. Renan. Next, he traces the course of the pretended rivalry between St. Peter and St. Paul, and then the reconciliation between their respective followings—the whole with the same minuteness of detail, and the same unhesitating trust in his own powers of divination, as in the case of the missionary's lodging. Lastly, he describes the extinction of Jewish tendencies in the Christian Church; prophecies with much precision the course events would have taken had the Temple not been destroyed; and concludes by enumerating the means which the shrewd rulers of the Church of Rome adopted to secure the ascendancy which they have held from the beginning.

We began this notice with the intention of refuting M. Renan by putting side by side the passages in this small volume which directly contradict each other. But even this method of refutation we think it needless to employ. The book—we say it with satisfaction—will serve only to diminish still further a reputation which, unimpaired, might be a power for evil. It were well for Christian truth that every hand raised against it were nerveless as that of M. Ernest Renan.

At the close of his third *Conférence*, M. Renan intreated those of his audience who had it in their minds to visit the scene of St. Paul's execution, that they would sit down by the spot and there think of him and of his lectures. We know not if any amongst his hearers were moved by this flabby sentimentality. If, however, his words roused in any of those who heard them other feelings than disgust, we gladly leave M. Renan and his work to the homage which such an appeal could provoke.

3. *Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period.* By S. Hubert Burke. Vol. ii. John Hodges, 1880.

Any faithful picture of the doings and sufferings of Englishmen in the reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, Mary, and Elizabeth, must be dreadful to look upon, and this second volume of Tudor portraits is necessarily full of horrors. The more horrifying it is, the better will it serve the cause of truth, as long as the description instead of going beyond the reality of wickedness in high places and wretchedness among the serfs and slaves, only partially and inadequately puts the actual state of things before our mental gaze. Now that curiosity has been aroused by many strange disclosures, and educated men and women no longer suspect, but are sure, that the history of the Reformation, as they heard it in their youth, is founded upon a mass of deliberate false testimony, every year adds its offering of disagreeable truth, blackening more and more the once fair, but by this time very dark, memory of Henry and Elizabeth. They, the leading characters in the terrible tragedy, had always at their worst a dash of greatness to mitigate the disgust which the story of their pride and selfish cruelty excites, but in some of the minor actors we look in vain for one extenuating quality. Henry himself was "basely bad," but Lord Cromwell, and Archbishop Cranmer, and the Protector Somerset, and scores of other servile flatterers, surpassed their master in the depth of their depravity. Macaulay's words should be remembered: "When an attempt is made to set Dr. Cranmer up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times, to preserve his gravity."¹

Henry, as we all know, while he hanged Papists, burned Protestants. He had never renounced the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and as he felt his end draw near he began to be apprehensive about the state of religious feeling in the country, for he knew that he had a darker crime to answer for in death than all his sins of vicious self-indulgence. From his dying bed he made the members of his Council swear on bended knees to extirpate "the new heresy." Somerset himself, with perjury on his soul, the better to delude the King, received Holy Communion in his presence the day before Henry's death, profaning thus the True Body and Blood of our Lord, for the

¹ P. 75. The quotation is from Macaulay's *Essays on the English Reformation*.

time was then far distant of pretended Masses and the adoration of unconsecrated wafers.

The executors of Henry's will, which prescribed that his son should be educated a Catholic, and assigned £600 per annum for Masses to be celebrated for his soul's health, "took no less than twelve solemn oaths at different times, kneeling at the bedside of the dying monarch, that they would fulfil to the letter all the instructions written in the said 'will.'"² We know how Somerset and Cranmer kept their part of the sworn engagement.

The chief, though not the only, merit of these sketches of the deeds of some of the worst men that ever lived is that they do not mince matters. A little plain speaking is needed for our long befooled countrymen, who find the "jealous, ruthless tyrant" set down in Sharon Turner's romantic pages as "warm-hearted, gentle, and affable in private life, untainted in morals, &c.;" the Protector described by Gilbert Burnet as "a person of great virtues, eminent for piety, humble and affable in his greatness, sincere and candid in all his actions;" Cranmer accredited by Peter Martyr with the virtues of godliness, prudence, and truth, and so much of the grace of Christ that, "though all others are the children of wrath, yet in him piety and divine knowledge, and other virtues, might seem to be naturally born and bred." These shameless falsehoods have been repeated in large books and small, and drilled into the minds of children in Pinnock's Catechisms and the like trash, until they need a great deal of eradication. It ought not to be left to Catholic essayists to try to set right, in the teeth of Mr. Froude, the innumerable injuries done to historic truth by the writers of the Reformation; but all who hate a lie should join in the endeavour to undo the harm that has been wrought by malice first and ignorance afterwards. The unsuccessful attempt which was made to kill by silence Dr. Frederick Lee's recent volumes on the Church under Elizabeth, shows that there are still not a few Englishmen who would rather hug a pleasant illusion than help to make known facts which are not to their liking.

² P. 258.

4. *St. Francis of Assisi.* By the Rev. F. Léopold de Chérancé, of the Order of Friars Minors Capuchins. Translated from the French by R. F. O'Connor. London: Burns and Oates, 1880.

St. Francis of Assisi is one of the best known of all the Saints of holy Church, and yet a new Life of him is very welcome. He is indeed one of whom we can never know enough, and the recent disinterment of a copy of the contemporary narrative of Bernard of Besse, to which the Bollandists allude without, as it would seem, having had any acquaintance with it beyond being aware that it had once existed, affords ample reason for writing a new book about him. Father de Chérancé, however, informs us that he had resolved to publish a fresh Life of St. Francis before the fortunate discovery was made, and that it only served to confirm him in his purpose and add ardour to his zeal. There were some minor errors of dates and localities in the popularly received account of the foundation of the Order, which it was desirable to correct before they became incorrigible. The old chronicle is chiefly interesting as giving a fresh authentication to the beautiful stories with which most Catholics are familiar in the *Fioretti* of St. Francis. Bernard of Besse gravely relates the most wonderful of these as historical facts, and there is no conceivable reason why they should not be substantially true. German historians may change as they please the she-wolf that suckled Romulus and Remus into a nurse of the name of Lupa, though it is a wiser plan to deny the whole episode, but it is really too bad that the penitent wolf of Gubbio should be manufactured by a similar process into Lupus, a brigand, reclaimed by St. Francis from the error of his ways. Romulus and Remus are personages of very dubious antecedents and surroundings. If they ever lived at all, it was a long time ago. No history is extant written by one who was personally acquainted with them; and, as we are quite sure that the god Mars was not their father, we may well suppose that a wolf was not their nurse; but St. Francis lived in historic times, the events of his life are known in great detail, and one who had conversed with him and his first companions is our informant. Although the story is so familiar, we shall be pardoned for repeating it.

Gubbio is a little town near Assisi. A large wolf had committed many depredations, and was the terror of the place. St. Francis went out alone to expostulate with the enemy:

"Come here, brother wolf; come, I order you in the name of Christ; do me no harm, neither me, nor any one." The wolf came. "Brother wolf, you have committed great crimes." The wolf hung down his head. "You have not only killed animals, you have been so cruel as to devour men made to the image of God. You deserve to die! Every one complains of you, and you are an object of horror to all the inhabitants of the country. But it is my wish, brother wolf, that you should sign a treaty of peace with them. I know hunger is the sole cause of your crimes; promise me therefore to lead an innocent life, and, on their part, the inhabitants will forgive you the past, and henceforward provide for your subsistence." Then St. Francis returned with the wolf at his heels, and after administering a similar rebuke to the inhabitants, bidding them repent of their sins, he called upon the leading men to swear to the observance of the treaty. The wolf became an out-door pensioner, and a general favourite, and died in a good old age, universally regretted. In all this there is certainly nothing derogatory to the dignity of the Creator of men and animals, nothing inconsistent with the character of the Saint, and nothing a tenth part as wonderful as the imprinting of the stigmata, to deny which would be "offensive to pious ears," since the Church has honoured the occurrence with a special Mass and Office.

The first companion of St. Francis was Bernard di Quintavalle, learned, noble, and very wealthy. The second was Peter di Catana, who became the first vicar-general of the Order. The third was Brother Giles, of proverbial simplicity. These three were all of Assisi. The fourth was Sabbatino; the fifth, Maurice; the sixth, the Judas of the holy company, John di Capella, who fell by covetousness, and hanged himself in the sequel. His vacant place was immediately filled by William the Englishman. The seventh was Philip the Long (or tall); the eighth, John of St. Constant; the ninth, Barbari; the tenth, Bernard di Viridante; the eleventh, Angelo Tancredi; the twelfth, the priest Sylvester.

5. *A Forbidden Land*. Voyages to the Corea. By Ernest Oppert. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington.

Situated in the most easterly portion of the Asiatic continent, the Corea has succeeded in isolating itself from the commerce and civilization of the world for a longer period than

either China or Japan. This book has been published partly to record the failure of three separate attempts made by M. Oppert, a Frenchman, to penetrate into the country as far as its capital and induce the Government to open out friendly relations with the foreigner, and partly to make his readers better acquainted with the history and character of the different races forming its population. When questioned respecting their own origin and descent, the Koreans express entire ignorance upon the point. Their features are said to bear the stamp of two distinct races, the Mongolian and the Caucasian, and contradict the long prevalent impression that they were an offshoot from the Chinese. Innumerable large and small islands, on the west, south, and east coast, are subject to the undisputed sway of the Korean Government. Amongst the largest of these are Kang-wha, Quelpart, and Ollong-to. The mainland is intersected throughout by many ranges of mountains, which leave little room for the development of extensive plains, or for the formation of large streams and rivers. The very dangerous navigation of their coasts has proved the best protection of the inhabitants against foreign invasion, and the mouth of the chief river, the Kang-kiang, conducting to Saoul, their capital, is well guarded by enormous sand-banks.

M. Oppert asserts the entire independence of the Korea from any vassalage or suzerainty to China, while its King, or present Regent, is an absolute monarch. The supreme power is in the hands of the father of the real King, who has usurped the regency against the will of the people, and to him must be attributed both the recent persecution of Christians, and the obstinate refusal to admit any strangers into the country. The management of all Government affairs rests with six Ministers, each charged with a separate department. The eight provinces are under the rule of governors residing in their respective capitals, each province being divided into circuits, which again are subdivided into districts. All officers, from the governor downwards, are appointed for the period of only two years, when purchase-money is exacted from them, and they are removed to some other place. Every high functionary is bound to report twice a year to the King upon the officers under his orders, and the tenor of his report is affected by the bribe which he may succeed in obtaining. Two hundred years ago some control was held over this system by the appointment of special officers, called wandering inspectors; but so wise a measure is

only a thing of the past, and the actual state of affairs is bad enough. M. Oppert traces down carefully the different changes of dynasty in Corea, having availed himself of Japanese historical records, and he mentions, as especially worthy of notice, that about the close of the eighteenth century several Coreans attached to the Embassy at Pekin had been converted to the Roman Catholic creed. Unlike Chinamen, the Corean, he says, becomes a Christian from conviction, not from any mercenary motives. As compared with Protestant, he gives the palm to Catholic missionaries, and freely allows that a far greater success attends their labours, as they were soon able to count their adherents by thousands. "Two Roman Catholic missionaries entered the country secretly in 1835, and were joined in 1837 by a third. They even settled in Saoul, and remained in that capital quite unmolested until 1839. For reasons which have never been cleared up, they were then suddenly arrested, and after a short trial decapitated, upon which a fresh persecution was undertaken against all converts, which was carried on with great severity. When the defeat of the Chinese took place in 1861, a State Council was held, in which resolutions were passed to accede to all demands and to throw the country open to foreign intercourse; and the Government went even so far as to designate one of the royal palaces which was to be pulled down to make room for the erection of a Christian church, in atonement for the murder previously committed on the three missionaries." With the extinction of the Ni dynasty all these favourable symptoms disappeared, and the son of a distant relative of the royal family having been adopted at the age of four years by the Queen dowager and elected as next in succession, his father wrested the whole power into his own hands, under the title of Regent. Subsequent attempts made by the French Government to take reprisals for the murder of its missionaries ignominiously failed, and after the year 1866 the Corea seemed more firmly closed against all communication with Europeans than ever.

The chapters descriptive of the manners and customs, castes, religion, business habits, and military arrangements of the people, are full of novel interest, at the same time that the narrative of the three voyages which the writer made to their coasts gives us fresh insight into their character, and shows how ripe and anxious every class amongst them is for the breaking up of their present exclusiveness.

6. *Manuel de la Langue Assyrienne.* Par M. Joachim Ménant. I. Le Syllabaire, II. La Grammaire. III. Choix des Lectures. Paris, imprimé par autorisation du Gouvernement à l'Imprimerie Nationale, 1880.

The study of Assyrian and Babylonian antiquities will increase in importance if the excavations in the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris continue to yield such valuable results as in the last few years. We know now from the discovery of many fragments of Assurbanipal's library, that there must still be numerous treasures hidden in the mounds of Assyria, and the scanty historical notices found in Babylonia tell us that we may hope to light upon fuller historical texts capable of throwing great light on the early and later history of those vast regions. The greater number of the Babylonian inscriptions examined hitherto contain only private legal documents and descriptions of temples with records of their foundation and restoration from the earliest times until the period of the Greek Empire. More recently a document has been found recalling the restoration of a temple at Birs-Nimrûd by Antiochus Soter at the beginning of the third century B.C. Such monuments as these have naturally renewed the interest which the earlier Babylonian discoveries had excited, and elementary books intended to introduce young students into this branch of archæology are in request.

M. Ménant has sought to meet this want by publishing a second edition of his elementary grammar, in which he proposes to set forth what has been so far achieved in the study of the Assyrian language. Since the first edition in the year 1868 many works have been published on this subject, and many details of Assyrian grammar have been developed in scattered articles in various scientific journals. It is very much to be regretted that these important materials have not been more fully brought to bear upon this new edition, according to the expectation which the title of the book is calculated to arouse. Although this fine volume of 380 pages in large 8vo, splendidly printed, cannot fail to be of great use to beginners, yet very little is shown of the progress that has been made up to the present time. In the beginning of these investigations it was necessary to establish principles and to take for granted many grammatical forms, borrowing them by analogy from the other Semitic languages in order to complete the system, but now that very many inscriptions have been subjected to the test

by actual perusal, we require much more exactness in the details, for thus alone can we hope to make true progress.

The first part of this Manual contains the Syllabary of the cuneiform writing. Here the author gives the list of the characters, as he has proved them in his earlier grand work on the Assyrian Syllabary, and as they are generally admitted by Assyrian scholars. Certainly a beginner may be terrified by seeing these immense lists with all the different variants and the hieratic and archaic forms, but in pursuing his studies he will find that most of them are very seldom used, and even then only in difficult passages which have not yet been sufficiently explained. We should have preferred to see a longer treatise on real paleography, enabling a student to examine for himself the original memorials. The author would then have been compelled to make the necessary distinctions between the various historical periods of Assyrian and Babylonian writing, and he would not have been exposed to the danger of mixing up old and new characters, a fault which leads easily to many wrong ideas in the study of archæology. As we can in our own writing distinguish a manuscript of the ninth century from another of the twelfth, fourteenth, or seventeenth century, so, in the same way, a good archæologist can easily from the form of the characters recognize approximately the age of an ancient monument; even the handwriting of certain Babylonian scribes in the fifth and sixth century B.C., can be recognized by a continual study of the original documents. If the author had paid some attention to this point, he would perhaps have expressed a different opinion on the so-called hieratic and archaic forms, which often depend upon a difference of the material used in the construction of the original monument on which the inscription is engraved. In the General List of signs of the Sumerian writing, which is certainly very useful for beginners, the references to the texts, if not necessary, would have been at least of very great use to give certainty to the readings, and those quotations would have added a great scientific value to the whole work, and would have excluded many mistakes, which beginners are now forced in all good faith to accept. The author has not imitated the example of exactness which Dr. Delitzsch has shown in his publications, and this is undoubtedly a thing to be regretted.

In the second part, the Grammar, an entire change was needed, and every grammatical form ought to be supported

by reference to texts. In this respect there is almost a positive injury done to the cause of Assyriology by this portion of the work. It is not wonderful that even now Assyrian studies are not in favour with classical scholars. Their attacks cannot be refuted except by scientific exactness in all the little details. Of course it is necessary in making out a *paradigm* to assume forms not yet found in the monuments, but such forms should always be distinguished from those which are known to have been in actual use, if we wish to lay a sure foundation of Assyrian grammar. Students will have, we fear, to work up the whole system for themselves in all its details and with minute attention, in order to make a safe grammatical comparison of Assyrian with Arabic or other Semitic languages.

The best part of the book, as regards the variety of texts, is the third part. The author has no intention of giving a full commentary, but the transliteration of the original text and the translation are quite sufficient to introduce a beginner to the study of other scientific publications on the same texts.

Briefly, then, this Manual will be found in some respects serviceable to beginners, but it is a very disappointing work, not sufficiently adapted to the present stage of acquired knowledge, and sadly inaccurate in details.

7. *Memoir of Gabriel Beranger, and his labours in the Cause of Irish Art and Antiquities from 1760—1780.* By Sir William Wilde, M.D. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1880.

The death of Sir William Wilde in 1876 left to Lady Wilde the task of completing the memoir of Beranger, of which all but the concluding portion was published in a few consecutive numbers of the *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Association of Ireland* for the year 1871. To the accomplished archæologist, whose devotion to the cause of Irish antiquarian research has earned for his memory the deep regret of many fellow-labourers, the biographical sketch of the "old Dutchman" Beranger was as a pleasing duty rendered to an old friend. It was only interrupted because more urgent business connected with the Irish census claimed in the later part of that year all Sir William's time and study. Shortly before his death he had resumed the subject, but he was not spared to publish what remained. It was his desire that the memoir should appear in a permanent form, after it had been contributed in parts to the *Archæological Journal*.

Gabriel Beranger, who was born at Rotterdam about 1730, came of the Dutch branch of a French Huguenot family of which some other members had settled in Ireland. His marriage with a cousin of the Irish branch was the cause of his establishing himself in Dublin, where he lived to a good old age, dying in 1817 at No. 12, St. Stephen's Green. Both as artist and antiquary, he was an ardent and energetic workman, but in the earlier period of his professional labours he was fain to improve his resources by keeping a print shop and artist's warehouse, and even by accepting a situation as accountant. He has left behind him "a large collection of drawings, plans, designs, architectural and geometrical sketches, and elevations of ruins, and antiquarian objects of interest in Ireland, many of them no longer existing; several landscapes; a large volume of notes made for the Irish Antiquarian Society, from 1779 to 1781; also carefully written descriptions of a great number of ruins in different parts of the country, as they existed a century ago," and other memorials. From these sources of information, Sir William Wilde has drawn his account of the very interesting artistic excursions made by Beranger into nooks and corners where the simplicity of patriarchal life still lingered in that old Ireland, removed from the days in which we live by a longer interval of social change than of measured time. Sir William Wilde considers the question of the Round Towers as quite sufficiently solved for all who do not stand committed to mystic fancies, and are still free to use their common sense. The Danish and Oriental theories are according to him mere follies, Dr. Petrie having fully proved "that the towers are of Christian and ecclesiastical origin, and were erected at various periods between the fifth and thirteenth centuries."

8. *Intimations of Holy Scripture as to the state of Man after Death.* By the Rev. W. H. Karslake, M.A. William Skeffington, 163, Piccadilly.

We lay this book down asking ourselves, "Does Holy Scripture after all teach, or intimate, so very little about what is to man the most interesting of questions?" Except for the mention of Christ our Redeemer and the resurrection of the body, these "intimations" do not land the reader very far in advance of the story of Er the Armenian in the tenth book of Plato's *Republic*. The idea of the book, however, is a good one, and is worthy of being taken up and worked out by a child of that Church, which not merely intimates but teaches, as our

Lord commanded: "Teach [μαθητεύσατε, make disciples of] all nations." The Scriptures searched where God meant them to be searched, in the Catholic Church and through the medium of Catholic tradition, would return to the hand that so tried them a much more certain sound than they give forth to the hesitating touch of Mr. Karslake.

On one point the author's caution is really praiseworthy. Quoting from Shelley of the millions that

Shall live and die,
Who ne'er shall call upon their Saviour's name,

he observes:

Holy Scripture is concerned almost exclusively with the condition of those who have had opportunities on earth of knowing and serving God as revealed to man in Christ, and who have either heartily embraced, or persistently rejected, the privileges which they thus enjoyed; so that we should not look in it for any full solution of questions relating to those to whom such advantages have been denied in this present world.

What becomes of the mass of heathen populations in the next life is God's secret, not written in Scripture and not confided to the Apostles. This only we know, that none shall be condemned everlastingly except for flagrant violation of a known Divine law. The heathen of course had the law of nature more or less clearly stamped upon their hearts. No doubt they often broke that law. How they were to get their sins forgiven by perfect contrition and love of God above all things, they who knew God so imperfectly, that is a difficulty to the Catholic theologian. Still the consideration of God's bounty leads us to believe that forgiveness must somehow have been within their reach, not ostensibly and in name only, but practically. Thus, if they sinned, we trust that many of them repented and were forgiven before death. At any rate, Mr. Karslake has good ground for asserting that we have no Scripture warrant for their universal condemnation.

II.—NOTICES.

1. *The Spoken Word: or the Art of Extempore Preaching.* By Rev. Thomas J. Potter. Dublin, 1880.—A great many valuable suggestions to young preachers are here thrown together in narrow compass. The author does not profess to lay down rules by which men can acquire those higher gifts of genius which belong to few men in each century, but his object is to show how men of average ability

may, with a little earnest effort in self-training, acquire at least so much of sacred eloquence as to be able to do real and lasting good to souls. Ordinarily the faults which make a sermon ineffectual are vagueness and discursiveness, and the preacher must first have a clear idea of his own purpose, and must teach himself to keep to the point. Accordingly, the larger part of this useful treatise is occupied with counsel and exhortation to observe logical sequence and unity of design, and to use ornamental diction only for the purpose of making careful thought more acceptable. There positively must be a plan of discourse in the mind, unless the preacher happens to be a Lacordaire able to find his way to the hearts of his hearers by a method of his own, unscientific although not illogical. Every thought proclaimed from the pulpit must be the speaker's own, either originated by himself, or duly assimilated, and for this it is necessary that he should "think out" his subject for himself, and should keep within his range.

Cui lecta potenter erit res,
Nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo.

2. *The Via Crucis*. From the original Italian Devotion of St. Leonard of Port Maurice recited in the Coliseum at Rome. Translated by W. H. Anderdon, S.J. London: Burns and Oates, 1880.—The Stations are, and deserve to be, a favourite devotion of our time. It is a great pleasure and advantage to receive from Father Anderdon both a faithful version of the Italian prayers and directions about the order and method of practising the devotion according to the spirit of its prime promoter, St. Leonard of Port Maurice. Still we cannot agree with him in wishing to see St. Leonard's very inferior strophes substituted for the inspired verses of the *Stabat Mater*, which seem to have almost a sacramental efficacy in rousing to compunction, and which in Mr. Aubrey de Vere's exquisite translation retain a large amount of their spiritual excellence, though it is still true that they cannot be translated. If the substitution of the *Stabat Mater* was by necessity rather than choice in the first instance, we regard it as a happy necessity, and do not pray to be delivered from it, but we join our hopes to Father Anderdon's that the version here adopted, which in addition to its intrinsic merit retains the original metre, may shortly supersede all others.

3. *A way of assisting at Mass, according to the Four Ends of Sacrifice*, by Father Kingdon, S.J. (Burns and Oates), will commend itself to the use of devout Catholics, not only as a collection of excellent prayers, but also and much more as a practical instruction upon the hearing of Mass, and indirectly we may hope that it will be accepted as an exhortation to that most solid of all practices of piety—the daily attendance at the Holy Sacrifice, without which many feel, and all right-minded Catholics not impeded by serious business ought to feel, that there is "a something wanting."

ST. JOSEPH'S
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,

48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY (EXCEPT SUNDAYS AND DAYS OF OBLIGATION) FROM
HALF-PAST TEN TO ONE, AND FROM TWO TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

NEW BOOKS FOR OCTOBER.

A Life's Decision. By T. W. Allies.
Life of King Alfred. By Rev. A. G. Knight.
Life of St. Catharine of Siena. By A. T. Drane.
Life of the Prince Consort. Vol. V.
Anglican Schism. By Nicholas Sanders.
The Anglican Ministry. By A. W. Hutton.
The Greatest Heiress in England. By Mrs. Oliphant.
Eight Months in an Ox Waggon. By Sandeman.
Nordenskiöld's Arctic Voyages.
Donna Quixote. By Justin M'Carthy.
Memoires de Mde. de Rémusat.
Records of the English Province S.J. Vol. V.
The Jesuits. By B. N.
Pauline Marie Jaricot.
Les Philosophes Convertis. By Charles Bussy.
Les Splendeurs de le Foi.
Le Miracles et les Sciences Medicales. By Père Bonniot.
Training of the Apostles. Vol. I. By Father Coleridge.
Little Miss Primrose. By Author of St. Olaves.
Eutropia. By Father Pius Devine.
Life of St. Thomas of Hereford. By Father Strange.
The Beleaguered City. By Mrs. Oliphant.
Life of Bishop MacDevitt.
Stumbling Blocks made Stepping Stones.
Lays and Legends of Thomond.
Nordenskiöld's Arctic Voyages.
La Saint-Barthélemy. By M. l'Abbé Lefortier.
Prophecy of St. Malachy. By Rev. M. J. O'Brien.
Life of D. Bartholomew of the Martyrs. By Lady Herbert.
Metaphysics of the Schools. By Father Harper.
Sunshine and Shadow. By Mrs. Brassey.
Procès de la Reine. By Raoul de Navery.
Through Rough Waters.
Bernadette. Par Henri Lasserre.
Per Crucem ad Lucem. By T. W. Allies.

A large collection of English and Foreign Works.

Special arrangements for Book Clubs.

A Children's Library at a lower rate for circulation amongst the poor.

BURNS AND OATES' NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Endowments of Man, considered in their relations with his final end.
A course of Lectures by BISHOP ULLATHORNE.

Contents:

Lecture I.—On the Nature of Man. Lecture II.—Why Man is made in the Image of God. Lecture III.—The Secondary Image of God in Man. Lecture IV.—Creation and Providence. Lecture V.—Self and Conscience. Lecture VI.—Self and Conscience as unveiled in the Book of Job. Lecture VII.—On Evil and the Origin of Evil. Lecture VIII.—On Justice and Moral Evil. Lecture IX.—On Penal Evil or Punishment. Lecture X.—Why Man was not created perfect. Lecture XI.—The Fall of Man in connection with the Fall of the Angels and the Redemption of Christ. Lecture XII.—The Restoration of Man. Lecture XIII.—The Regeneration of Man. Lecture XIV.—From the beginning to the end of Man.

Marion Howard; or, Trials and Triumphs. By the Author of "Maggie's Rosary and other Stories," "Lady of Neville Court," "Peter's Journey," etc. New edition. Price 5s.

St. Francis of Assisi. By the REV. F. LEOPOLD DE CHERANCE, of the Order of Friars Minors Capuchins. Translated from the French, with the Author's special permission, by R. F. O'CONNOR. 396 pp., 8vo, 7s. 6d.

New and revised edition, containing references to English and Irish Saints.

Catholic Birthday Book, beautifully bound in limp leather, gilt edges and lettering, price 3s.

Just published.

God in His Works. A Series of Reading Books for the Children of the Church. By the Sisters of Mercy of the Kinsale Community. Also Vols. I. and II. Price 1s.

Life of Pope Pius IX. By MAGUIRE. Messrs. Burns and Oates have a small stock of the above work, at the reduced price of 1s. 6d. nett per copy.

A Way of Assisting at Holy Mass, according to the Four Ends of Sacrifice. By FATHER KINGDON, S.J., Beaumont College. Price 1d.

New Edition now ready of P. SCHOUPE's (S.J.) Abridged Course of Religious Instruction, Apologetic, Dogmatic, and Moral. For the use of Catholic Colleges and Schools. One Vol., crown 16mo, price 3s.

The Via Crucis. From the original Italian Devotion of St. Leonard of Port Maurice. Recited in the Coliseum at Rome by the Venerable Arch-Confraternity Degli Amanti di Gesu e Maria al Calvario. Translated by W. H. ANDERDON, S.J. The "Stabat Mater" translated chiefly by AUBREY DE VERE. Price, cloth, 6d.; paper, with preface, 4d., without, 3d.

Freville Chase. By E. H. DERING, Author of "Sherborne," and "Memories of Georgiana Lady Chatterton." A novel in two vols. 12s.

A Catechism of the Vows for the use of persons consecrated to God in the religious state. By FATHER COTEL. 2s.

Nearly ready.

Anglican Ritualism, as seen by a Catholic and Foreigner. A Series of Essays; with an Appendix on the present position of the Church in France. By ABBE P. MARTIN, D.D., Licentiate of Canon Law, Professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris, and honorary Canon of Cahors.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES, 17 and 18 Portman Street, W.,
and 63 Paternoster Row, E.C.

